

The North Indian Review

Vol. 20

Part. 2

1854

Sas.
Librarian

Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library
Govt. of West Bengal

CONTENTS OF No. XI.

Art.	Page
I. 1. Notes and Emendations to the Text of Shakespeare's Plays, from Early Manuscript Corrections in a copy of the Folio 1632, in the possession of J. Payne Collier, Esq., F.S.A. 8vo. London, 1852. 1p. 538.	
2 The Plays of Shakespeare: The Text regulated by the Old Copies, and by the recently discovered Folio of 1632, containing Early Manuscript Emendations. Edited by J. Payne Collier, Esq., F.S.A. 8vo. London, 1853. 1p. 900,	281
II. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. By the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Rev. J. S. Howson, M.A., Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool. 2 vols. London, 1852,	319
III. 1. The Ancient Music of Ireland, arranged for the Piano-forte, to which is prefixed a Dissertation on the Irish Harp and Harpers, including an Account of the Old Melodies of Ireland. By Edward Bunting. 4to. Dublin, 1810.	
2. A Collection of National English Airs, consisting of Ancient Song, Ballad, and Dance Tunes, interspersed with Remarks and Anecdotes, and preceded by an Essay on English Minstrelsy. Edited by W. Chappell. 2 vols. 4to. London, 1838-40.	
3. Catalogue of the Library of the Sacred Harmonic Society. London, 1853,	341
IV. 1. Nouveau Manuel des Aspirants au Baccalauréat ès Lettres. Par Emile Lefranc. Vingt-Sixième édition.. Année Scolaire, 1852-1853.	
2. Programme des Cours de la Faculté de Droit de Paris. 7ième Novembre 1853.	
3. Kalendarium Archigymnasii Pontificii Bononiensis. Anno Scholastico. 1852-1853.	

4. Prospetto degli Studii dell' Imperiale Regia Università di Padova per l' Anno Scolastico. 1851-1852.
5. Lunario Pisano. 1853.
6. Circular of the Graduates' Committee of the University of London. 6th September 1853, . . . 361

V. 1. Dissertations on the Life and Writings of Herodotus by
(1.) Dahlmann. Altona, 1823. (In English, London, 1845.)

(2.) Heyse. Berol., 1827.

(3.) Jäger. Göttingen, 1828.

(4.) Bahr. Lips., 1835. (In the Fourth Volume of his edition of Herodotus.)

(5.) K. O. Müller. Library of Useful Knowledge. (Chap. XIX. of his History of the Literature of Ancient Greece.)

(6.) Kenrick. London, 1811. (In his edition of the Egypt of Herodotus.)

(7.) Schmitz. London, 1846. (In Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology.)

(8.) Pococke. London, 1850. (In the new edition of the Encyclopædia Metropolitana.)

(9.) Mure. London, 1853. (In the Fourth Volume of his Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece.)

2. De Thucydide et Herodoto Quæstionum Historicarum Specimen Scripsit E. A. Salomon, Professor. Berol., 1851.

3. Herodotus and the Athenians. By the Rev. J. W. Donaldson. December, 1813. (Proceedings of the Philological Society, Vol. I., No. 15.)

4. Herodotus, Clio. Book I., with a Commentary by J. W. Blakesley, B.D., late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. London, 1852. (Being part of an edition of Herodotus, which is to appear in the Bibliotheca Classica.)

5. Tales, &c., founded upon Herodotus, by

(1.) Rev. W. Adams, M.A. The Fall of Cræsus. London, 1846.

(2.) C. E. Moberly, M.A. Stories from Herodotus. London, 1818.

(3.) J. E. Bode, M.A. Ballads from Herodotus. London, 1853, . . . 389

VI. 1. Die Verhandlungen der Wittenberger Versammlung für Gründung eines Deutschen evangelischen Kirchenbundes. Berlin, 1848.

ART.

Page

2.	Die Verhandlungen des 2ten Wittenberger Kirchentages. Berlin, 1849.	
3.	Die Verhandlungen des 3ten bis 6ten Kirchentages. Berlin, 1850-1853.	
4.	Lehrbuch des Katholischen und Evangelischen Kirchenrechts. Von Dr. Æmilius Ludwig Richter. 4te Auflage. Tauchnitz. Leipzig, 1853.	
5.	Urkundenbuch der Evangelischen Union. Von Dr. Carl Immanuel Nitzsch. Bonn, 1853.	
6.	Für Beibehaltung der Apochryphen. Aus der Evangelischen Kirchenzeitung. Berlin, 1853.	
7.	Die Apochryphen. Von Dr. Rudolph Stier. Braunschweig, 1853,	423
VII. 1.	François Arago. Par J. A. Barral, ancien Elève et Répétiteur de Chimie de l'Ecole Polytechnique, Directeur du Journal d'Agriculture Pratique. Paris, 1853.	
2.	Discours de M. Flourens, Secrétaire Perpétuel de l'Académie, prononcé au funéraille de M. F. Arago, le Mercredi, 5 Oct. 1853.	
3.	François Arago. Par M. De la Rive. In Bull. Univ. de Genève, Oct. 1853, Tom. xxiv. pp. 264,	459
VIII.	Cybele Britannica; or British Plants, and their Geographical Relations. By Hewett Cottrell Watson. In three volumes octavo. London, 1847-1852,	50
IX. 1.	Progress of Russia in the East. New Edition. London, 1853.	
2.	The Russian Shores of the Black Sea, in the Autumn of 1852. By Laurence Oliphant. Edinburgh and London, 1853.	
3.	The Frontier Lands of the Christian and the Turk. By a British Resident of twenty years in the East. London, 1853.	
4.	The Ottoman Empire and its Resources. By E. H. Michelsen, Ph. D. London, 1853.	
5.	Progress of Russia in the West, North, and South. By David Urquhart. Fourth Edition. London, 1853.	
6.	Russia in the Right. By Joseph Moseley, B.C.D. London, 1853.	
7.	The Partition of Turkey, an Indispensable Feature of the Present Political Crisis. By Veritas. London, 1853.	
8.	The Present Crisis; or, the Russo-Turkish War, and its Consequences to England and the World. By Coningsby. London, 1853.	
9.	The Three Eras of Ottoman History. By James Henry Skene. London, 1851,	523

652114
Vol. 20
(H. 2)



THE

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

FEBRUARY, 1854.

- ART. I.—1. *Notes and Emendations to the Text of Shakespeare's Plays, from Early Manuscript Corrections in a copy of the Folio 1632, in the possession of J. PAYNE COLLIER, Esq., F.S.A.* 8vo. London, 1852. Pp. 538.
2. *The Plays of Shakespeare: The Text regulated by the Old Copies, and by the recently discovered Folio of 1632, containing Early Manuscript Emendations.* Edited by J. PAYNE COLLIER, Esq., F.S.A. 8vo. London, 1853. Pp. 900.

It must be admitted that the science of Verbal Criticism has not had the fortune to acquire much of the veneration of the general mind, or of those who know nothing about it. It might at first appear as if the *Omne ignotum pro magnifico* did not hold in this case. But the fact is, that there is not suspected to be any thing about the branch of learning in question which is either magnificent or unknown. Professing to concern itself only about words, it is supposed to relate to nothing that can be very new, or of much importance, to anybody.

Yet, if we deny the importance of words, we must deny a good deal. It is of words alone that all writing, all literature consists. It all takes the shape of words. Whatever else may be the originating force or the elementary material, a contexture of words is the finished fabric. That is the only form in which thought or feeling can manifest itself to us in literature. The criticism of words, therefore, is really the whole doctrine of literature considered as an artistic product. For it is the expression alone in which Art of every kind distinctively resides. What lies behind the expression may be something of much greater

moment, but it is no part of the artistic character of the production. The moral spirit either of a literary composition, an Ode of Horace or Anacreon, for instance, or of a picture or a statue, makes no part of its artistic character. Art, in fact, to speak plainly, is nothing more than a cunning; and, like any other cunning or skill, it may be exerted, in any of its forms or degrees, for a bad end as well as for a good one, or in obedience to vicious as well as to virtuous impulses. The thought or feeling itself is quite a distinct thing from its artistic expression. The same conception or belief which in one man expresses itself artistically, may in another express itself only in conduct or action, or may not express itself at all. Expression of any kind is not an absolute necessity of thought. Of course, the more vivid or impassioned any thought is, the more strongly will it tend to express itself in some way or other. But neither clear nor even methodical thinking is the same thing with or any part of the artistic. The most methodical thinking is only logic, not art.

On the other hand, the connexion which expression has with thought is much more intimate than many people suppose. They have been taught to regard it as merely something in which thought is attired. But expression is much more than the dress of thought. It would be nearer the mark to call it the blossom of thought, or to say that it was to thought and emotion what the flame is to its sustaining heat. It is not a foreign annexation to thought, but its outgrowth or product, its continuation, a part of itself. It springs from the thought, as much as the portion of the plant that is visible above the ground springs from what of it is hidden below. The two are really, so to speak, one substance, or the one is only the other in a different form. This sets expression very high. It is the reflection of thought, if you will, or its picture, or its impression, or it is thought crystallized, or reduced from the fluid or gaseous to the solid state; in any way of looking at it, or figuring it, it is still essentially thought. It follows, that, generally speaking, or in every case in which the expression is of any moment at all, there can be only one adequate expression for the same thought. Change the expression, and you change that which is expressed. You change, if not actually the thing said, at least, in a greater or less degree, the effect with which it is said. And the more complex, or subtle, or delicate the thought, the more liable it is to be affected by any alteration of the words in which it is conveyed. In no writing that is really artistic can even a syllable be altered except for either the better or the worse.

It is common to meet, both in talk and in print, with the notion that it is only the writer of inferior genius, or no true genius at all, whose compositions are very much dependent for their effect

upon the words which he employs. The original thinker, it is argued, or the great inventive poet, need scarcely mind in what words he expresses himself. His power, which resides in his matter, will make itself be felt through any disadvantages of manner. Or, although his expression should to a considerable extent be lost or corrupted, it would be of little consequence. So long as enough remains from which to gather his meaning, we have all that we need to care for. And the example which is most frequently appealed to by our English preachers of this doctrine is that of Shakespeare. Any of his plays, we are told, will, after all, interest and charm an unsophisticated reader as much in the worst text or edition as in the best. The other qualities or ingredients of the work make us, or ought to make us, quite forget the words. We have the story, we have the characters, the situations, the meeting and contending passions, all that constitutes the action of the drama; we have all that really makes the imitation of life and nature in the ever animated and pictured page; even the rich and felicitous imagery, and the deep philosophy, cannot be more than very slightly obscured, and that in most cases only for a moment, by any injury which the expression may have sustained. Nothing, in short, is destroyed; some things are only made perhaps a little more difficult of apprehension, or a little less striking at first sight, than they would otherwise have been. The royal form is unmistakable, for all the beggar's rags that flutter about it.

Now we will not deny that something of all this does or may occasionally happen. Whatever be the field or the object of contemplation, only let the mind be strongly excited, and there is hardly any deformity in what it admires that it will not overlook, or any deficiency which it will not in some sort supply out of its own resources. But the creative power thus called into activity is always dependent, at least for the character or quality of what it produces, upon the native capacity and acquired intelligence of the mind. The commonest lunatic may people his chamber with grinning demons; the grotesque and the hideous are the weeds of the mind, and spring up readily in any soil; but we must not take quite *au pied de la lettre* what we are told about the lover seeing in the Egyptian brow of any rustic Audrey or Jaquenetta that may have inflamed his fancy the beauty of the incomparable Helen. He may see as much of it as the amount of the sense of the beautiful with which he is endowed will allow him to imagine. And even the lover most gifted in this way would probably find his brightest imaginations outshone and dimmed by the sight of the real Helen.

People who believe that the perfection of the expression is little or nothing in writing, are usually, in truth, indebted for

their simple creed to their want of the requisite amount of qualification and perception to enable them to judge of such matters. They are much in the condition of those lovers of music with whom the neglect of the sharps and flats counts for nothing, and who sometimes think their taste for melody all the truer and purer on that account. It is no doubt an advantage which such a reader has over others in the perusal of a corrupted text of any great writer, that he is insensible or less sensible of its defects.

What distresses a finer organization, or a more learned and cultivated taste, gives him no annoyance. Flats or sharps, true concords or false, in tune or out of tune, it is all, within certain liberal limits, the same to him, and very satisfactory music. It is as good as he has any notion of or feeling for. But any higher excellence is a thing for which he has no sense, and all art properly so called is thrown away upon him. His coarse and indiscriminating voracity is a hunger only, not a taste.

Least of all is a reader so easily pleased, and of so undistinguishing an appetite, the person to enjoy and appreciate the art of Shakespeare. It is evident that with Shakespeare words were as much things of life as thoughts themselves. At one time, indeed, his sensitiveness in regard to language seems to have verged upon something almost morbid or preternatural. In the earliest of his purely original writing and invention we may discern the traces of his having a distinct perception of every syllable, both in its sense and in its sound, in its meaning and in its music, somewhat such as one has of the throbbing of the pulse in certain abnormal states. It is as if they each flashed visibly before his eyes, or hit him a slight blow, as they rose to his thoughts. In the plays belonging to this period, the love of word-catching, that horror of his modern critics, which never altogether left him, may be said to be indulged in as an end rather than as a means, and as if he could not help it, or at least without any effort to restrain or control it. Perhaps we may say that we have him abjuring or bidding farewell to that form of the style in *Love's Labour's Lost*, where in the closing scene, Rosalind imposes upon Biron the penalty of trying the effect of his incessant mocks and comparisons and flouts for a twelvemonth upon wretches speechless from disease or groaning with pain, as the true way "to check a jibing spirit," and to weed that wormwood from his too fruitful brain. But it is only the original form or rather spirit of so favourite a mode of writing and thinking that he then abandons or makes his escape from; in *Richard the Second* and in *Romeo and Juliet*, both serious, even deeply tragic, dramas, the sporting with words and syllables goes on as fast as ever, with this difference only, that now it is no longer a mere display of ingenuity for its own sake, or out of very wantonness or prodigality of power,

but, even when it is most fantastic, almost always what we recognise to be in the circumstances the truest and most forcible expression of earnestness or passion. Nor, although there is much less of it in his later works, and he is there completely lord of his art, did he deem it necessary ever absolutely to debar himself from dallying upon occasion with what the critics contemptuously call a verbal conceit or quibble:—we all remember the lofty Johnsonian taunt of “the fatal Cleopatra,” and the comparison of the unhappy poet to his own Antony, or rather Dryden’s, in that regard. Yes; we must admit that Shakespeare continued to the last to be keenly alive to every thing that there is in words,—although we may not be quite of opinion that in the indulgence of this susceptibility he either lost the world or was content to lose it.

We believe that in whatever Shakespeare wrote with his whole heart and soul, and we think that all the plays properly to be considered his own must have been so written, the expression was throughout, and in every sentence and every syllable, as happy as the thought. His feeling of all the proprieties of language was evidently exquisite, and his mastery over its resources boundless. We cannot, therefore, conceive of him as ever breaking down or failing in that. If in any instance we were to admit that he had done so, we should be driven to suppose that the passage had been written when he was half asleep. In him nothing could account for imperfect expression but indistinct or half thinking. We believe that usually thought and expression were one act of his mind; that is to say, that, whenever the conception had assumed its ultimate and complete form, it had likewise shaped itself into words, into the words best suited for it, or the only words by which it could be adequately expressed; but if it should in any case have happened that the fitting words should not at once have presented themselves, we have no notion that he would ever have satisfied himself with others that gave only a dim or distorted representation of what he wished to say. The right words would be certain to be found by the effort of a few moments. It is impossible to imagine such a writer ever descending to the lazy and helpless expedient of taking any words that might merely have a chance of suggesting his meaning, or a part of it, and so leaving what he ought to do himself to be half done for him, if done at all, by the reader. If we could suppose Shakespeare to have been in the habit of writing upon that principle, we should be obliged to deny altogether his claim to be regarded as an artistic writer. He would not deserve to be called even a good writer, but rather only a very bad one. For always, be it remembered, what is not the right word is a wrong one. To

hesitate in regard to this point in the case of Shakespeare is in truth only a remnant of the old prejudice which, admitting his genius, really did refuse him all credit for any knowledge of the art of writing, and looked upon him as nothing better than an inspired semi-barbarian. It was a theory entirely self-contradictory, and as absurd and incredible as it would be to say of any force in nature that it was at once strong and weak, strong naturally and inherently, but weak whenever it ceased to be inactive. But if Shakespeare's expression were of the inartistic character supposed, his case would certainly be a singular one in the literature of the world. Of no other great writer of a poetical order, in any language, could the same thing be predicated. With regard to each and all of them, from Homer to Goethe, it has been felt that the expression, in its minutest peculiarities, is a sacred and essential part of whatever they have written. Wherever we have good reason to believe that we have that as it came from the writer, then we feel that we have everything. There is nothing more either to be had or to be desired. *Le style c'est l'homme* has been the principle always professed, always acted upon. Let the words only be admitted to be those which actually came from the writer, nobody would dream of altering one of them, or of supposing that they could be improved by alteration, any more than one would think of altering and improving a feature in an authentic portrait of some distinguished personage of a former age.

The text of the Shakespearian drama is circumstanced as no other text is either in modern or in ancient literature. For above half the entire number of the plays commonly attributed to Shakespeare, we are dependent exclusively (or at least we have hitherto been considered to be so) upon what is called the First Folio—that is, the first edition of the collected plays, which was published in a folio volume in 1623, when the author had been seven years in his grave. Three other editions in the same form which followed, in 1632, 1664, and 1685, were all evidently printed from the first, or from one another, with only certain variations, for the most part introduced in the second, which, with very few if any exceptions, are either obvious misprints, or alterations made to all appearance arbitrarily and often tastelessly and ignorantly. There was at one time a disposition in some quarters to set up the second folio as an equivalent authority against the first; but that is now over with editors and commentators of all sorts and schools, although there may be some few lines in which the reading of the second folio has, without any distinct understanding or agreement as to its source, been generally preferred. Eighteen of the plays, indeed, are known to have been previously printed in the author's lifetime;

and Mr. Knight thinks that nine of these at least have all the appearance of having been published by his own authority. We confess, however, that, notwithstanding the ingenious and plausible arguments by which this opinion is supported, we much doubt its being well founded. Mr. Collier, we observe, in the Introduction to his *Notes and Emendations*, reiterates the expression of his conviction that there is not one of those plays with the publication of which Shakespeare had anything to do. But, be the fact with regard to the nine plays as it may, we are left dependent upon the First Folio, and certain previous quarto impressions admitted on all hands to be surreptitious, for our only text of all the rest, making above three-fourths of the whole.

Of works produced since the invention of printing, we generally have at least one edition which has passed through the press under the eye of the writer, or, if not, of some other person of known literary accomplishments and habits, whose name is a fair guarantee that the author's manuscript has been faithfully adhered to. In some cases we have in addition the original manuscript, or an authenticated or carefully made transcript of it, to refer to. More than this we cannot well have, or reasonably desire; if, after all, there be anything in the text which has a doubtful look, which there rarely will be in such circumstances, there is no help for it; we must make the best that we can of the passage as it stands; we have got the best text, and the only text, which the case admits of. Conjectural emendation of such a text would be a very presumptuous and hazardous operation. Of works of importance written before the invention of printing, again, we have usually more than one manuscript, in some cases a great many more than one; and the received text, in so far as it rests upon authority at all, is made up of readings selected, according to the established principles and canons of critical science, from all of them. A different system, indeed, has been advocated or proposed, and in some instances followed, in the modern editing of mediæval remains; it has even been the cry of a certain school of antiquaries among ourselves, that the true (as it is certainly the easiest) way to obtain a good text of such an author as Chaucer is to take it exclusively from some one manuscript; but we believe there is no approved text of Greek or Roman antiquity which has been formed in this way, except only in some few cases in which such adherence to a single authority has been matter of necessity from no other being known to be in existence; and then commonly the text either is a very unsatisfactory one, or has been brought to a better condition only by having been very freely subjected to conjectural emendation. Of several or many manuscripts, no doubt, one may sometimes be conspicuously preferable upon the whole, or in the general character of its

readings, to any of the others, and will be valued and deferred to accordingly; but still not by any editor worthy of the name to the extent of being held sufficient to sustain an inherently suspicious reading, against either another codex or even a highly probable conjecture, by the mere weight of its authority. At the best, the reading, if highly improbable in itself, must be held to be doubtful, if it be not deemed clearly and indisputably wrong, and be not compelled, notwithstanding all the authority in its favour, to yield its place to another for which there may possibly be no authority at all.

These, however, are not the views by which the fashion of editorial doctrine and practice has for a considerable time past been influenced and directed in the case of the text of Shakespeare. Here we have had for the last half century more and more of what may be called the antiquarian in contradistinction to the philological, or what alone deserves to be accounted the critical method of forming a text,—the only method, that is to say, which demands any exercise of judgment on the part of an editor. It has been more and more insisted upon by one Shakespearean editor after another, that the only way of forming a true text of this writer is to keep as close as possible to the First Folio. Malone may be said to have begun the movement, for, if Steevens was in point of fact the first both to preach and exemplify the principle, he was also the first to give it up; but it has been carried a good deal farther by Malone's successors than it was by himself. One might even hope from the height to which the tide has risen that it was on the point of turning. And indeed symptoms of that are not altogether wanting. When Mr. Collier published his edition of the plays a few years ago, he too, as he acknowledges in the first of his two recent volumes now before us, was, like the other modern editors, strenuous in contending for the integrity of the text as derived from the early printed copies. In fact, his inclination was to receive the authority of the First Folio as almost infallible, and his practice to follow it slavishly in we may say every case in which it was not manifestly and absolutely impossible that it should be right. But now we have him not only renouncing and denouncing the text he had thus been wont to swear by in more than a thousand particular instances, but speaking familiarly in general terms of "the old careless and absurd printing," and frankly admitting both the "shamefully disfigured" state of the plays in not a few of the quartos and the "many blunders they unquestionably contain in the folios." "To the verdict of common sense," he finally goes to the length of saying, in speaking of his new readings proposed on the suggestion of an anonymous manuscript corrector, "I am willing to submit all the more material alterations recommended

on the authority before me. If they will not bear that test, as distinguished from mere verbal accuracy in following old printed copies, I, for one, am content to relinquish them." Here is surely by implication an unmistakeable and unqualified declaration of allegiance to the philological or rational in preference to the antiquarian mode of dealing with the problem of determining a right Shakespearian text.

We are far from saying that this worship of the First Folio by Malone and his followers is all foolishness. Although we have had enough of it, or more than enough, and it is now, as we think, full time that there were an end of it, it has hitherto probably been productive upon the whole of more good than evil. It is not to be denied that it has led to the amendment of the text in many passages. And, kept within proper bounds, its spirit is a right one. In the settlement of the ancient classical texts likewise conjectural emendation has in our recent scholarship been advantageously exercised with a considerably more scrupulous regard in all cases to the indications of the codices than formerly. Nor is it possible to be insensible to a certain attractiveness for the imagination which there is in this First Folio idolatry. As in many other cases, something of the antiquarian feeling comes in here. Dear to the eyes and to the heart of all lovers of Shakespeare must ever be the venerable old volume, now so rare and precious, in which the whole amount of what he had bequeathed to his land's language was first disclosed to our forefathers, and which was, we may say, for nearly a century their only Shakespeare,—it and its imitations, or repetitions, the other three Folios. It seems to bring us while we read it into closer communion with him and his time than any modern edition of his works. And, whether it be the effect of contrast or from whatever cause, the glory of the poetry, and all the inner life and soul of the writing, seem to blaze out upon us with added force and power from the very homeliness or rudeness of the material form in which they are presented to the eye. One wonders if any effect of a similar kind would be produced by one of the plays being acted in the simple old natural way,—in the mode of representation for which it was actually written—if not literally under the open sky, yet with no more of artificial scenery than might suffice to enable the excited imagination of the spectators to paint all that was needed for themselves, instead of that affluence and luxury of decoration, which, indeed, as the matter is now managed, saves them that trouble, but by which, at the same time, the delicate spiriting of the poet's pen is perhaps always somewhat vulgarized.

There is besides, however, in the superstition of which we speak an element that naturally is in an especial degree seductive

to the editorial mind. It is a sort of popery, with the comforts and conveniences of that form of religious belief, providing an infallible guide for the critical conscience, and relieving its votaries at once from all doubt and from all exercise of their own judgment. Any difficulty that arises is settled by a simple reference to the Folio. The reading found there is to be accepted as a matter of course. There is still, to be sure, the true meaning of the oracular response to be discovered, and often there is but slight appearance in it of meaning of any kind; but, of course, some interpretation can always be proposed. Wonderful things have been done in that line. Such exercise of ingenuity is mere sport in comparison with the labour and responsibility of critical deliberation and decision—and particularly when the principles upon which it is conducted are so loose as to admit of almost any sense being extracted from almost any words.

Let us take an example or two. Everybody is familiar with the concluding words of the King's soliloquy at the opening of the third act of the Second Part of *Henry the Fourth*. In the First Folio they stand exactly thus:—

“Then happy Lowe, lye downe,
Vneasic lyes the Head, that weares a Crowne.”

The first of these lines is commonly exhibited in the modern editions as “Then, happy low, lie down!” It is so, for instance, that Mr. Collier gives it. But it has been proposed to be altered in various ways. Warburton suggested that the true reading was evidently “happy lowly clown,”—the *cl* of the last word having been mistaken by the printer for a *d*; and Johnson admitted this emendation into his text. It is unfortunate in being so very neat and ingenious; one has the same feeling about it as when we say of a piece of news that it is too good to be true. Coleridge, again, had another notion:—“I cannot help feeling,” says he, “that *Happy low-lye-down!* is either a proverbial expression, or the burden of some old song;” accordingly Mr. Knight has adopted this way of printing the words, calling the reading one “depending on the punctuation,”—a phrase apt to mislead, for, as we have seen, there is nothing in the manner in which the passage is pointed in the Folio to support Coleridge's interpretation (which may, nevertheless, be right). Still another form of the line is found in an early transcript of the play, an impression of which was edited a few years ago for the Shakespeare Society by Mr. Halliwell: there the words stand, “Then.(happie) low ly downe,”—equivalent to “Then, happy, low lie down!” of our modern punctuation and spelling. Thus Mr. Halliwell himself conceives to be the preferable way of giving them. “The passage,” he observes,

"is not more obscure than many in Shakespeare." He interprets it as meaning, "Then lie down low, being happy." To us, we confess, this interpretation needs an interpreter. It cannot be meant, we presume, that we are to understand *low* as an adverb qualifying the verb *lie*; "to lie down" is intelligible enough, but "to lie down low" hardly is; besides, that in that way of construing the words we should want altogether the necessary limitation of the apostrophe; it would be an address to the universe at large. We must suppose that "Lie down low" is understood by Mr. Halliwell as meaning "Lie down, ye low" (or ye lowly). The words had been long ago translated by Steevens, "You, who are happy in your humble situations, lay down your heads to rest!" This would be all very well if we were dealing with a sentence written in Egyptian hieroglyphics, or in such an imperfectly understood language as that of the inscriptions on the ancient Assyrian monuments. But Shakespeare wrote in English; and everybody knows that in that language "happy low" and "low lie down" are not allowable or possible expressions for "happy ye low" and "lie down, ye low, or ye that are low." The adjective cannot be so used alone. With all respect for Mr. Halliwell, we must say that we do not believe that there is any uncorrupted passage in Shakespeare, or in any other writer in the language, in which we have such a construction or collocation of words as he imagines that we have here.

Again, take the famous passage at the commencement of *Measure for Measure*, in which, as it stands in the First Folio, the Duke, addressing Escalus, after having delivered himself of a brief exordium, continues:—

"Then no more remains
But that, to your sufficiency, as your worth is able,
And let them worke."

It can hardly be doubted that there is something wrong here—some words misprinted, or left out, or both; and this has been generally admitted. Various emendations have been proposed: Warburton changed "But that" into "Put that," (for the want, by the bye, of any notice of which alteration made by him in the text his note, as given in Malone and Boswell's *Variorum* edition, is unintelligible); Theobald, Johnson, Steevens, Tyrwhitt, Mason, Malone, all tried their hands upon the rectification of the passage; finally, Mr. Collier's recently discovered manuscript annotator (of whom presently) corrects it:—

"Then, no more remains,
But add to your sufficiency your worth,
And let them work."

It is probable that "your sufficiency" here may mean your authority, or the powers with which you are entrusted, although Malone understands it differently: "*Sufficiency*," he says, "is skill in government; ability to execute his office." But in Mr. Knight's opinion the words stand in the Folio probably as Shakespeare wrote them; he would only insert a colon at the end of the first line, (thus destroying what surely is the most natural-looking syntactical construction in the whole passage;) and he offers the following amazing interpretation:—"Then, no more remains to say on government; but your science, joined to your authority, as well as your virtue, is equal to the duty; and call them into action."

Is this, then, Shakespeare's manner of expressing himself? Is this the sort of English that he writes? If it were, instead of being one of the greatest of writers, he would be one of the poorest and worst. But, in truth, in fathering upon him such passages as those that have been quoted, and many others, we treat him as no other writer has been treated. Let us see what evidence we have for believing that in such instances the First Folio has accurately preserved for us what really proceeded from his pen.

• It is common to speak of this earliest collection of Shakespeare's dramatic works as having been *edited* by his two friends Heming and Condell. The fact is, that their names are subscribed to the Dedication and to the Preface. They neither themselves take the title, nor make any profession of having performed the function, of editors. They describe themselves simply as the collectors of the plays. They regret that the author himself had not lived "to have set forth and overseen his own writings;" but, for themselves, all that they claim to have done is to have collected and published them from his manuscripts without any mutilation or omissions,—meaning, plainly, without any intentional falsification. Although, of course, they go as far as they can in disparaging the previous impressions of single plays, this is all that their words can fairly be held to assert: "Where before," they say, "you were abused with divers stolen and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed by the frauds and stealths of injurious impostors that exposed them, even these are now offered to your view cured and perfect of their limbs, and all the rest absolute in their numbers (it ought undoubtedly to be *members*) as he conceived them." They go on to declare that they have scarce received from the author a blot in his papers; and from this expression it seems to have been sometimes supposed that they had become the possessors of Shakespeare's manuscripts by his own bequest. That is evidently quite an unwarrantable interpretation. The only bequest to

Heming and Condell in Shakespeare's Will is one of "twenty-six shillings eight-pence a piece, to buy them rings;" and it is one of the omissions in that document which might be expected most to surprise a modern reader; (though, while a great deal has been said about others, we hardly recollect to have seen this one noticed), that it makes no mention whatever of his manuscripts or literary remains

There is no reason to believe that the two individuals in question, if they had attempted much editing of the plays, would have done so to much purpose. Their names are entirely unknown in connexion with literature. Both were actors; and Heming appears to have also been in business as a grocer. The efficient correction of the proof-sheets for a folio volume extending to not far short of a thousand double-columned pages, and set up, as this seems to have been, from copy partly in print, partly in manuscript, and we do not know how far perplexed and difficult on other accounts, would have demanded considerable literary experience and familiarity with the press. The two actors, in all probability, left all that to the printers; and very wisely. As the known friends of the deceased author, they put their names to the Preface and the Dedication in attestation of the general authenticity of the collection, which could not well be ushered into the world in the circumstances;—clearly could not be presented to the "Incomparable Pair of Brethren," the Earls of Pembroke and Montgomery, for their patronage and protection,—without somebody being got to go through that formality. It is quite unnecessary to suppose that they were the writers of the addresses which they so subscribed. With regard to the Preface at least, Steevens has made it extremely probable that it was the composition of Ben Jonson.

The volume, therefore, it may be expected, will be found to be in respect of typographical correctness, very much as if it had had no proper editor, and had been superintended in passing through the press only by the ordinary functionaries of the printing-office. Even in the present day so large a volume would hardly in the same circumstances come from one of our best-appointed establishments without being disfigured by numerous errors; and two centuries ago the common printing of popular literature in England was something barbarous compared to what it now is. But we are not left to such general and hypothetical reasonings. The volume itself affords abundant evidence of its having enjoyed no regular editing, and of the revision of the proof-sheets having been often of the most careless kind.

The printing has evidently been distributed into portions, several or all of which were probably executed simultaneously.

There would appear, from the pagination and the signatures, to have been at least six such divisions or parcels; but there may have been more. Visible breaks occur at the end of *The Winter's Tale*, being the last of the pieces entitled "Comedies;" at the end of the *Second Part of Henry IV.*; again after *Henry VIII.*, the last of the "Histories;" then we have *Troilus and Cressida* stuck in, apparently, by an afterthought, for not only is it not paged (with the exception of one of the leaves,) but it is not entered in the "Catalogue" at the commencement of the volume; then comes what seems to be another distinct bundle, comprehending from *Coriolanus* to *Tyrion* inclusive; and lastly, another consisting of the remaining "Tragedies," beginning with *Julius Cæsar*. If the printing of several of these parts of the volume was carried on at the same time, there would be the greater chance of the sheets being sometimes sent to press in the hurry with very little revision. And this circumstance may also have something to do with the explanation of what is admitted on all hands to be the case, and indeed is manifest, that some parts of the volume are much more incorrectly printed than others.

But there is not a single play that can be said to be well, or what would now be called even passably, printed. All are in a greater or less degree disfigured by errors which are universally acknowledged and cannot be denied to be such, with readings which no modern editor, however zealous for adherence to the ancient text, has ventured to retain, or for a moment dreamed of retaining. Of course, we say nothing of the irregular spelling. No system or standard had as yet been adopted for the orthographic representation of the language, and the first edition of Shakespeare is no worse printed in that respect than the generality of books, or we might say, all other English books, of the same date. Nor would it be just to count all the irregularities and inaccuracies of the punctuation against the fidelity of the text. The point of most frequent occurrence, the comma, is still scattered about with a sufficiently lawless or uncertain hand by many compositors and correctors of proof-sheets; it is employed in this volume rather more capriciously than in the ordinary printing of our day, and probably with even a less distinct perception in many cases of how it affects the sense, or of its affecting it at all. The case is different, however, with the other points; it is not to be supposed that full stops, and colons, and semicolons, to say nothing of points of interrogation or interjection, were conceived to be mere harmless and unmeaning decorations, or that the insertion of any such point where it ought not to be can be other than the result either of negligence or of deliberate misconception. Every instance of clearly erroneous punctuation to

this extent, therefore, must be held to tell against the printing or editing. So also every instance of the misarrangement of the verse, or of the printing of prose as verse or of verse as prose; both of which kinds of perversion are found we believe we may say in all the plays, and are in some what may be called habitual, even if we reckon up only the cases in which the fact neither can be nor has been denied or disputed. Then there is the blundering in various plays in regard to the names of the *dramatis personæ*. For instance, in the *Merchant of Venice*, "nothing," says Mr. Knight, "can be more confused than the manner in which the names of *Salarino* and *Solanio* are indicated. . . . In the text of the Folio we find *Salarino* and *Starino*; *Silanio*, *Solanio*, and *Solino*. . . . But, if there be confusion in these names even when given at length in the text, the abbreviations prefixed to the speeches are 'confusion worse confounded.' *Solanio* begins with being *Sal.*, but he immediately turns into *Sola.*, and afterwards to *Sol.*; *Salarino* is at first *Salar.*, then *Sala.*, and finally *Sol.*" Elsewhere, again, instead of the proper names of the characters we have actually the names of the performers prefixed to the speeches; in the fourth act of *Much Ado About Nothing* Dogberry and Verges suddenly become in this way *Kempe* and *Cowley*. "Here, then," as Mr. Knight observes, "we have a piece of the prompter's book before us." The turn he gives to the matter is ingenious and elegant:—"We could almost believe that the player-editors of the folio in 1623 purposely left these anomalous entries as an historical tribute to the memory of their fellows." Finally, under this head of undisputed and indisputable incorrectnesses pervading the old folio is to be reckoned what we might almost call its systematic mis-representation of foreign words and phrases. Here, once more, we have the testimony of Mr. Knight, who in his Introductory Notice to *Love's Labour's Lost* notices "the manifold errors of the press in the Latin words" throughout that play, and subjoins the following observation from Steevens:—"It is very certain that authors in the time of Shakespeare did not correct the press for themselves. I hardly ever saw in one of the old plays a sentence of either Latin, Italian, or French without the most ridiculous blunders."

All this, however, goes for nothing with the modern editors. "Perhaps," says Mr. Knight, "all things considered, there never was a book so correctly printed as the First Folio of Shakspeare. If it had been reprinted, with a literal attention to the punctuation even, up to the present hour, we should have had a better copy than England possesses in a hundred shapes."* Such dis-

figurements as those that have been mentioned are, it is said, mere typographical errata,—that is, we suppose, such errors as have arisen, not from the manuscript having been misread or misunderstood, but only from its having accidentally happened that the right types were not used to express the intended word.

This is doubtless a kind of inaccuracy from which no book is absolutely free. Still such errors, even although the book could be convicted of no others, might be so numerous as very much to impair our confidence in a printed text. As it is said, *Humanum est errare*, so it may be said, with special emphasis, *Typographicum est errare*; nevertheless, here too “*Est modus in rebus, sunt certe denique fines.*” We demur, however, to the plea that the various undeniable and universally admitted depravations of the Shakespearian text to be found in the First Folio as above specified can be fairly described as only errors of this kind, errors of the press;—although even if they were all such, and there were no other errors in the volume except what might be so denominated, there would be no saying to what extent it misrepresented what Shakespeare wrote.

It is quite impossible, however, to contend that the text of the plays as there given is not deformed by many corruptions which must be referred to causes lying much deeper than an inattention to mere mechanical correctness. Our own belief is, that not only the superintendence of the volume in its passage through the press was left to persons very indifferently qualified for such a task, and was irregularly performed and sometimes altogether neglected, but that the copy, or manuscript put into the hands of the printers, was in various places difficult to be read, or, it may be, wholly illegible, either from the character of the hand-writings, or possibly from its having been sometimes nearly altogether defaced and obliterated. And this theory, as will be seen, will account for other phenomena besides the errors in the text of the Folio.

We are not seeking to make out a case against the printers, or against any person who may have been concerned in bringing out that volume. We daresay they all did their best, as far as circumstances allowed; and it is impossible to feel otherwise than in the highest degree grateful to those to whom we are indebted for having preserved, perhaps from destruction, even though not wholly without blemish or tarnish, so much of what holds the proudest place in our English literature. Mr. Knight, in commenting upon Steevens's objections to the authority of the First Folio, observes that “the insidious mode in which the most astounding errors creep into printed books, whilst it should make all authors vigilant, ought also to render all critics charitable, in

this particular." But charity to the printers is not the question; the question is justice to Shakespeare. That is the only question that anybody cares about having settled or discussed. We are not surely to be what is called charitable to the printers to the extent of holding Shakespeare to have written nonsense whenever they may have printed such.

Whatever may have been the general merits or good intentions of the editors of the First Folio, both their frequent negligence and their incompetency in certain respects must be considered to be sufficiently proved by the facts that have been already appealed to. The manner in which many of the Latin words and expressions are printed is demonstrative of the illiteracy of the correctors of the press. Other things in their workmanship testify as conclusively to their complete ignorance of the structure of verse, or indeed we may say of the difference between verse and prose; when they are right as to that matter it is only that they have gone blindly by the manuscript, as is clearly shown by the numerous instances in which, where the manuscript probably was defective or confused, they have blundered in a way irreconcilable with the most elementary knowledge. But what reason have we for assuming that their ignorance and carelessness were confined to those matters in which their blundering can always, or generally, be certainly detected and demonstrated? Is it to be supposed that they did not sometimes mistake other words as well as those in Latin phrases and quotations? that they did not mangle passages which they could not read, or did not comprehend, in other ways than by mispointing them, or cutting up the prose into the shape of verse and breaking down the verse into doggerel?

The truth is, that the passages are to be counted not by hundreds but by thousands in which there is reason either more or less strongly to suspect, or unhesitatingly to condemn and reject, the readings of the Folio. This may be unanswerably shown from the pages of those very editors who have gone the greatest lengths in their devotion to that copy, in their general professions of submission to its authority and in hostility to all conjectural deviation from it. The evidence is furnished by their own text and their own notes, and by the confessions and admissions, explicit or implied, which abound in both, and which, reluctant as they may often be, are not for that the less expressive, or the less conclusive.

The evidence in question is of four kinds. Of course, whenever we have a reading of the Folio expressly condemned in the modern edition, we have a testimony against the original text of the clearest as well as of the most impartial character. And not the less strong, though less frank, is the testimony to the same

effect that is borne by the silent abandonment of any of the old readings and the substitution of another. But besides these two cases there are other two. There is the case in which the interpretation that is offered of the old reading is manifestly one which the words will not bear; and there is the case in which, the words being apparently without any meaning or any that will suit the place where they stand, no interpretation or explanation of them whatever is proposed. It by no means follows that everything is certainly right where none of these four cases occurs; a reading may still be wrong which is neither openly admitted to be so, nor silently abandoned, nor unsuccessfully attempted to be defended, nor left a mere mystery or puzzle without a word of comment; but, clearly, wherever we have one of the four cases, we may regard the text of the Folio as having been given up either in express terms or tacitly and virtually.

We will now endeavour to give the unsuspecting reader of the modern editions of Shakespeare some notion of what the original text really is as compared with the closest copy of it which has yet been produced for popular use. Let us take for this purpose the First Act of *Macbeth*, and see how the text of the First Folio is treated by Mr. Knight. The exemplification of the statements that have just been made which we shall thus obtain will be very imperfect; but it certainly will not err on the side of presenting the general deficiencies of the old copy in too strong a light. We believe our selection of a portion of the text to be a fair one, or at least such as will not give us more than an average or medium result. It comprises nearly five pages, or between nine and ten columns of the Folio, and may extend to somewhere between four and five hundred lines. It contains many fewer difficulties or doubtful passages than other portions of the volume of the same extent.

First, then, (to arrange the several instances under the four heads that have been laid down, condensing into the briefest possible abstract the particulars gleaned by a somewhat tedious examination), the articulately acknowledged deviations from the old copy which we find in this portion of Mr. Knight's text are, as usual, but few. There are, however, some. The line, "shipwracking storms and direful thunders," which seems to be defective in the sense as well as in the prosody, is completed by the addition of the word "break," stated to be borrowed from the Second Folio; and the famous expression (in Scene 5th), which stands in both First and Second Folio "The effect and hit," is corrected, as in all other modern editions, into "The effect and it," with an intimation of the change, although none of its having been first made in the Third Folio. The change throughout the play of the original *weyward* and *weyard* into *weird*, which is

explained in a note, should perhaps be accounted only an orthographical emendation. It was first made by Theobald. Another of Theobald's corrections, however, which is adopted and acknowledged, is of a different character; that of "this bank and school of time," into "this bank and shoal of time." Finally, in two instances, and in two only, the metrical arrangement of the old copy is distinctly stated to be departed from; namely, in the speech of Malcolm at the commencement of Scene 4th, "My liege, they are not yet come back," &c., and in the subsequent speech of Macbeth, "The service and the loyalty I owe," &c.; in the former of which the readjustment extends over seven lines, in the latter over five, every one of the twelve lines being affected by the process.

The unacknowledged deviations are greatly more numerous. Some of them, indeed, may be thought to be mere modernizations of the spelling, or corrections of what can be considered little more than typographical errors. Still it should be understood that in the old copy *Inverness* and *Forres* are *Invernes* and *Soris*, (the latter error evidently betokening an incorrect or misread manuscript). So also, instead of the modern "We rest your hermits," we have in the Folio "We rest your Ermites." Other alterations, again, may be said to be made systematically, or in all cases, and therefore not to need pointing out: such are the substitution of the modern *than* for *then*, (as also elsewhere of *then* for *thun*, for, curiously enough, the two forms have exchanged functions), and the quiet accommodation to the modern rule of the old concord between noun and verb in such expressions as "Their drenched natures lies,"—a concord familiar with Shakespeare, and one instance of which, not admitting of obliteration, every reader will remember in the song in *Cymbeline*—"Those springs on chaliced flowers that lies." Other changes are still more rectifications only of matters of form; but it may be mentioned that the title *Lady Macbeth*, so impressive to us, was unknown to Shakespeare; in the Folio she is only *Macbeth's Wife* and *The Lady*. So with *Lady Macduff*, in the latter part of the play. In some things the plain state of the case necessitates a departure from the old copy; as when at the head of Scene 2d we have "Enter King Malcolm," &c. (instead of "King Duncan," or "The King, Malcolm," &c.); and, a little after, "Enter Rosse and Angus," where only the former actually appears; and, in Scene 6th, Duncan and his attendants made to be received at Macbeth's Castle, the situation of which, evidently seen in the daylight, so much delights them, with "Hoboyes, and Torches." Some of these slips do not indicate a carefully printed book; but, as they all admit of being put to rights without uncertainty, we do not insist upon them in our present argument.

The old text, however, is silently given up by Mr. Knight in many other instances throughout this Act which are quite otherwise circumstanced. In some the old word is rejected; thus we have in the modern text "kernes and *gallowglasses*," instead of *Gallowgrosses*; and, in the first line of Scene 4th, "*Are not*" substituted for "*Or not*," an emendation of the Second Folio (which has not, however, been adopted by all the modern editors). In other cases the pointing is altered so as completely to change the sense. Thus, in Lady Macbeth's speech near the end of Scene 5th all the Folios have

"Your face, my Thane, is as a book, where men
May read strange matters, to beguile the time.
Look like the time," &c.;

whereas the modern reading, as is well known, connects "to beguile the time," not with what precedes, but with what comes after. So, in Macbeth's soliloquy with which Scene 7th opens, instead of the modern "Might be the be-all and the end-all, here," we have in the original text a full point after "end-all," and what follows—"Heere, But heere," &c.—left to stand as an independent sentence. In the last line of the same speech Mr. Knight, without intimating that the reading he gives is new, substitutes a dash for the full point which stands in the folio after the words "And falls on the other," in the notion, as he states, that they are merely the beginning of a sentence which is interrupted and left incomplete. Lower down in the same scene we have another instance of the same kind: Macbeth's interruption of his wife's vehement appeal with "If we should fail" is also made a broken sentence by Mr. Knight, and pointed with a comma and a dash, instead of the point of interrogation which it has in the old editions; and Lady Macbeth's rejoinder—"We fail," which is also made interrogative in the Folio, he gives with a full point after it, intimating, however, what the original punctuation is in the latter case.

But the most remarkable departure from the old reading without notice occurs in Banquo's speech in Scene 6th—

"This guest of summer,
The temple-haunting martlet," &c.

In a note upon this passage Mr. Knight says; "We request our readers to repeat these celebrated lines as we have printed them. Our text is a literal copy of the original." But this can only be intended to mean that the metrical arrangement is the same as in the Folio. In other respects the passage has undergone important repairs. Not only have we in the original *Barlet* instead of *martlet*,—to say nothing of *Mansonnry*, from which has been deduced the not altogether unquestionable *mansionry*

of the modern editions (for some would read *masonry*)—but the conclusion of the speech there is altogether different from the modern version in the punctuation, in the language, and in the sense. Mr. Knight's reading is—

“ No jutting, frieze,
Buttress, nor coigne of vantage, but this bird
Hath made his pendent bed, and procreant cradle :
Where they most breed and haunt, I have observed,
The air is delicate.”

But in all the Folios the three last lines stand thus :—

“ Hath made his pendent bed and procreant cradle,
Where they must breed, and haunt : I have observed
The air is delicate.”

Mr. Collier in his new edition has “ Where they *much* breed,” whether upon the authority of his manuscript annotator does not appear. *Much* we should think very likely to be the true word. *Most* was Rowe's conjectural emendation.

But this is not all. The metrical arrangement of his original is silently departed from by Mr. Knight in more than a score of places—twenty-two at the least, as we count them—in addition to the two instances in which such deviation is acknowledged ; the number of lines readjusted each time running from a single line to four. In all about fifty lines of the Folio text are thus indirectly condemned, besides those that are openly confessed to be misprinted. In four instances at most it might perhaps be contended that the alteration is only apparent ; but these are the most unimportant of the whole number ; in others the manner in which the lines are exhibited in the Folio evinces an utter insensibility to the rhythm of verse, and the most complete ignorance of its laws and principles, and of every thing about it, in the persons by whom the preparation of that edition was superintended. For example, immediately after one of the passages in which Mr. Knight emphatically calls attention to the superiority of the old metrical arrangement, we come upon the following specimen of dancing doggerel (it is in Scene 6th) :—

“ Against those honours deep and broad
Wherewith your majesty loads our house :
For those ~~of~~ old, and the late dignities,
Heap'd up to them, we rest your ermites.”

We proceed now, in the third place, to those readings of the old text which must be held to be either manifestly erroneous, or at least in the highest degree suspicious, notwithstanding that they are defended, as well as retained, in the modern edition.

These it will be enough that we enumerate, without further subdivision, in the order of their occurrence.

The first that meets us is in the first speech of the wounded soldier (or *Captain*, as he is called in the Folio), where he is made to speak of Fortune smiling on the *quarry* of the rebel Macdonwald. It is clear on every principle of syntax and of common sense that the pronoun *his*, at any rate, which precedes the doubtful substantive, cannot possibly refer to any other person than the rebel. He is in fact the only person who has been mentioned. Yet Mr. Knight will have "his quarry" to mean the quarry, or prey, of Macbeth!—of whom not a word has yet been said, nor is said till two lines lower down, and after not only the present division of the sentence has been completely finished, but the connexion broken by the intervention of another independent clause, or what we might almost call an entire sentence, though a short one. Malone reads *quarrel*, which is commonly stated to have been first proposed by Johnson, but, if we may trust Jennens's collation, it had been previously adopted both by Warburton and Hanmer. It is also the correction of Mr. Collier's manuscript annotator.—Immediately after this, instead of Steevens's arrangement,—

"Like valour's minion,
Carv'd out his passage, till he fac'd the slave"—

Mr. Knight deliberately and with notice restores that of the Folio, in which the division of the lines is made at the word *passage*. The effect is to produce a line and a hemistich, the one and the other of which are both alike impossible.—Then we have the manifest nonsense, in Scene 3rd—"as thick as tale can post with post,"—which is the reading of all the Folios, retained on the plea, that, although the passage is somewhat obscure, "the meaning is as evident under the old reading as the new." The new reading, which is Rowe's, is "*Came* post with post."—Soon after, in the same scene, the Folio presents us with the following extraordinary specimen of versification:—

"Or did line the rebel with hidden help,
And vantage; or that with both he labour'd
In his country's wrack, I know not."

And this "metrical arrangement" Mr. Knight adopts; describing it as "not a perfect one, certainly, but better than the modern text." Not a perfect one! It is not a possible one: the two full lines and the hemistich, or imperfect line, are one and all such as we may be perfectly sure Shakespeare never wrote or could have written.—The same thing may be said of the following lines which occur a little lower down:—

“ My dull brain was wrought with things forgotten . . .
 Let us toward the king; think upon
 What hath chanc'd : and at more time.”

Here Mr. Knight's text is only a partial restoration; but it retains two of the above lines. He objects to the attempt of other modern editors to get rid of the hemistich, “ Let us toward the king;” but that hemistich is of his own invention; there is none such in the Folio; and, besides, it is (unless we adopt a pronunciation of the word *toward* never found in Shakespeare) a commencement for a verse which is inadmissible in any circumstances.—In the next Scene Macbeth's expression, “ doing every thing *Safe* towards your love and honour,” may possibly be right; but it is at least doubtful, and certainly is not satisfactorily explained either by Sir William Blackstone's interpretation of *safe* as equivalent to *saved*, or by Mr. Knight's paraphrase, “ Our duties are called upon to do every thing which they can do *safely*, as regards the love and honour we bear you.”—Nor can we be altogether without some suspicion as to the line in Scene 6th, “ Smells wooingly here : no jutty, frieze,” of which Mr. Knight finds the harmony to be perfect.

There still remain a few instances coming under our fourth head, readings of the old copy that may be suspected, although they are adopted without a word of question or comment in the modern edition. Where Lennox says, in Scene 1st, “ So should he look that seems to speak things strange,” the verb *seems* has little apparent appropriateness. *Comes* is substituted by Mr. Collier's manuscript annotator, decidedly to the improvement of the expression. Banquo's phrase in Scene 3d, “ That, *trusted* home,” is not very intelligible; nor is the *thrusted* of Mr. Collier's copy much more satisfactory. King Duncan's “ might have been *mine*,” in the next scene, is in the highest degree suspicious; we have little doubt that *more*, which is substituted in Mr. Collier's copy, is the right word. Nor can there be much, if any, that in Macbeth's soliloquy in Scene 7th the true reading is not “ *This*,” but “ *Thus* even-handed justice,” as proposed by Mason and also sanctioned by the lately discovered manuscript corrector. And there may be some other instances that might be brought forward, if we were in want.

Such then is what is called the original Shakespearian text. We have not, be it observed, been criticising or examining any modern edition, or the labours of any modern editors, except only in so far as we are thence enabled to obtain the most unexceptionable testimony to the defects of the old copy. We have, as far as it was possible, avoided expressing an opinion touching any of the new readings, excepting only in their relation to that question. Numerous as have been

the points which we have been obliged to notice, we have passed over everything, in text and commentary, which did not bear upon our special object. Nor have we, even in dealing with the ancient text, applied to it a very microscopic scrutiny; besides giving it the benefit of sundry doubtful passages, upon which we have made no remark, we have abstained from reckoning up any of its inaccuracies except those that, if they are such at all, really do affect the sense or the style. Some few of those that have been brought forward may appear to be of inferior significance; but we do not believe that, of the whole number, there are so many as half a dozen at the most that could, upon any fair or intelligible principle, be struck off from the enumeration as too minute or trivial.

And what is the result at which we have arrived? In a portion of the text of the First Folio extending to only between four and five hundred lines, we have found the number of readings which are either clearly, and for the greater part confessedly, erroneous, or such as at least do not seem to admit of satisfactory explanation or defence, to be not much under a hundred, or one for every five lines. The measure that we thus obtain of the correctness of the old folio would give us about twenty false readings in every page, or about twenty thousand in the entire volume. But there may be a great many more. These are only the errors that reveal themselves, or that we can detect without any other help than the light of criticism or common sense; how many more there may be, lurking unseen and unsuspected, we cannot tell. It is very possible, that, if the author's manuscript were to be recovered, the entire number of the corruptions or misrepresentations in the original printed text might prove to be twice as great as it can at present be made out to be.

We are convinced, we repeat, that our calculation would not be reduced by the survey being carried out over the entire body of the plays. Some portions of the text might be found to be less disfigured than the one which has been examined; but others would turn out to swarm with palpable or probable errors to a still larger extent. We believe, in fact, that for every similar portion of the volume that might show more creditably under such an examination than the First Act of *Macbeth* there are two that would not come off so well. In one class of probable corruptions especially, that of passages or expressions of which no sense can be made, and of many of which no explanation has been adventured by anybody, the play we have chosen would certainly be far out-done by several others,—such as *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Cymbeline*, *Coriolanus*,—which, according to Mr. Collier, is the “worst specimen of typography in the whole folio,” but of which Mr. Knight holds that the text, “with the exception of a few obvious typographical errors, is wonderfully accurate,”—

and *Measure for Measure*, of the unsatisfactory state of the text of which even Mr. Knight complains,—standing up, nevertheless, for the irregularities of the metrical arrangement, which, he says, “was strictly copied, we have no doubt, from the author’s original, for a printer does not mistake the beginnings and ends of blank verse lines,” although in the Introductory Notice to *Coriolanus* we are told, on the contrary, that, “it would be a natural and almost unavoidable consequence of printing blank verse from a posthumous manuscript, that the beginnings and endings of the lines should be occasionally confused, and that therefore the metrical arrangement of the author would not be perfectly represented in the printed copy.”

But, even if the demonstrable incorrectness of the First Folio generally should be considerably less than the sample of it that has been gone over would seem to indicate, our proposition would still be abundantly made out. A text with half a score of false readings for every page, or one on an average for every ten lines, is not a text which can be regarded as entitled to much confidence. We care not from what cause its abounding and pervading errors may have arisen. If those who gave it to the world took all the pains they could, so much the worse. Either the persons by whom the book was carried through the press must have been incompetent if they were not negligent, or they had not the means of producing a better text. Something, clearly, was wrong or was wanting, whatever it was. Excuse it or account for it as we may, the fact remains undeniable that we have got a text deformed by numerous errors. Nor is it any thing to the purpose to tell us that at the time when the first edition of the collected plays of Shakespeare was produced all popular literature was carelessly and incorrectly printed in England, and that this volume is not distinguished in that way above the generality of contemporary publications, nay is upon the whole less incorrect than many or than most of them. It may be so ; but that again only makes the case worse. In addition to other presumptions of unfaithfulness we have that arising from its being common for texts of this kind to be unfaithful. Any comparison of the Folio Shakespeare of 1623 with other books of the same date is beside the question. Its incorrectness is proved from itself, and cannot be disproved by their greater incorrectness. Our conclusion is not affected by the relative state of the case, whatever that may be, but rests upon the facts taken simply and absolutely. Here is a text overrun with errors of all kinds, many of them setting doubt or denial altogether at defiance ; is its authority notwithstanding to be held to be infallible whenever we cannot convict it of being wrong on evidence amounting to positive demonstration ? or is it not rather in all

reason to be also mistrusted in many other cases, as well as in those in which we are thus forced to give it up?

We are well aware that these views are not calculated to be very acceptable on their first presentment even to the generality of the mere readers and lovers of Shakespeare, any more than to his editors and commentators. It is unpleasant to have our faith disturbed in anything upon which we have been accustomed to believe or to rely; our self-love is even disposed to take it as an insult to be told that we may possibly have been admiring and cherishing that which after all is not what it pretended to be and what we took it for. Besides, it is not only in religion that uncertainty and doubt are hateful to the human mind; they are so in everything, in proportion to the interest we take in it. The feeling, indeed, is not only a natural one, but is akin to our love of truth itself. Yet, like every other natural disposition and tendency, this too has its weak side, through which it is always liable to be taken advantage of and abused. In this way anything which can contrive never to be questioned, or which can make a plausible profession or show of being unquestionable, will usually appeal to us with more force than the mere reason of the case would carry with it. An authority calling itself infallible is to the mind what dram-drinking is to the stomach, which, if it does not actually help digestion, at any rate deadens for the moment the pain of indigestion, although it may be at the expense of the digestive power itself; so we are willing to be saved or relieved from the pains of doubt at the cost even of having our general power of thinking enfeebled and impaired. And, even when nothing of much moment can be imagined to depend upon what we believe, we love to be saved the trouble of thinking and deciding. It is a work which many people feel themselves in all cases to be as incapable of as of walking in the air. To attempt to shake their confidence, therefore, in anything which they have been wont to believe they look upon as tantamount to seeking to deprive them of a necessary stay. Their impulse is to resent it almost as they would an attempt upon their property. For these reasons, to cast a doubt upon anything whatever that is generally accepted has always been a thankless task. We all wish in our secret souls that nothing were doubtful, that there were no such thing as doubt in the world. And, indeed, to diminish the doubtful may be said to be the aim of all philosophy, of all research and discovery, of all the efforts and achievements of science and thought.

Yet with regard to many things we cannot know till we have first doubted; the true cannot be established before the false has been thrown down. And therefore sometimes the doubter or demolisher of the false must be tolerated, although he should

deal in negatives only, or may not in all cases be ready with an equivalent of positive and demonstrable truth to take the place of the error which he would sweep away. There is much error and falsehood for which no truth can be substituted; the sweeping of it out of the way is all that can be done. In the present case, while the more learned upholders of the authority of the Shakespearian text as found in the First Folio will very properly insist that nothing shall be yielded in the controversy to mere modern ignorance or prejudice, but that whatever is stigmatized as suspicious shall be so only upon considerations drawn from our language and our literature viewed in their entire history and extent, the rabble of critics, indignant that any one should presume to doubt where they have never doubted, incapable of giving a fair reception to anything which is new to them, and at the same time made uncomfortable by the objections advanced against their faith of use and wont, may be expected to pelt such dissent as we have here ventured to express with every kind of abusive imputation. And, besides the customary charges of cold-blooded scepticism, the spirit of destructiveness, the love of paradox, and the like, it may be asked what is gained by discrediting the commonly accepted text unless there be something better to be got in its stead? It should be answer enough, in this as in all other cases, to say, that our business is, as far as we can, to ascertain and assert the truth, and that in our pursuit of that we have nothing to do with consequences. But here, in addition to this general defence, we have to plead that we stand up for Shakespeare, for his honour and fame, for justice to his memory; we stand up for Shakespeare, and the rights of his genius, against the standing libels of the First Folio, and the incompetency, carelessness, and blundering of the persons by whom his dramatic works were originally given to the world through the press. With the indications that we have, swarming before our eyes in every page of the early copies, of the little skill and attention with which they were produced, we cannot consent to accept their evidence as conclusive in any instance in which it attributes to Shakespeare what it seems improbable on whatever account that he should have written. Even where a more satisfactory reading could not be or had not been suggested, we would rather hold the passage to be doubtful or hopelessly corrupt than receive it as correct on no better than such authority. Nothing, as we conceive, short of this is what we owe to Shakespeare. To assume as a matter of course that everything which we find printed as his is, exactly as it stands, what he must have written, is surely, in the actual circumstances of the case, the height of injustice.

Everybody who takes any interest in such matters has of course heard of Mr. Collier's discovery. His own account of it is given in the Introduction to the first of the two publications whose titles we have placed at the head of the present Article. It was in the early part of the year 1849 that, having recently completed his own edition of Shakespeare, he made a hasty purchase for a few shillings of an imperfect and ill-used copy of the Second Folio, in the hope of its enabling him to complete another poor copy of which he had been the possessor for some time; upon taking it home, however, and finding that it would not serve that purpose,—the two leaves which he wanted being too short and otherwise damaged and defaced,—he threw it aside, and thought no more of it, till he chanced to fall upon it again about a year after in selecting some books to take with him on his removal with his family from London into the country. It was then that he first observed what he describes as “some marks in the margin” of his ragged and greasy old tome; but still he seems to have forgotten the book after merely opening it and shutting it again. “It was subsequently,” he says, “placed upon an upper shelf, and I did not take it down till I had occasion to consult it.” When this happened we are not informed; apparently more than another twelvemonth had elapsed. He now detected a name upon the cover, which he at first thought might be that of an actor of the earlier part of the seventeenth century (afterwards ascertained to have borne only the same surname); and this and other circumstances, he states, at last induced him to examine the volume more particularly: he then discovered, to his surprise, “that there was hardly a page which did not present, in a handwriting of the time, some emendations in the pointing or in the text, while on most of them they were frequent, and on many numerous.”

It was in the *Athenæum*, we believe, that Mr. Collier made the first announcement of his discovery, communicating at the same time considerable specimens of the new readings. The news was decidedly the most exciting that had come upon the Shakespearian world since the Ireland forgeries more than half a century ago; and it was a matter of course that criticism, æsthetic, verbal, and antiquarian, should bristle up in all directions, and that the battle of the believers and unbelievers, as among our grandfathers on that other memorable occasion, should be immediately joined. Accordingly, the controversy has since drawn forth volumes or pamphlets from Mr. Singer, Mr. Knight, Mr. Dyce, Mr. Halliwell, &c., as well as been handled, more or less elaborately, in nearly every periodical organ of opinion among us, whether professedly literary or political, daily, weekly, fortnightly, monthly, and quarterly,—not to speak of the con-

tinued fire of *Notes and Queries* that has been kept up about it in the pages of the impartial repository so entitled, which, like an amplification of the ear of Dionysius, collects so curious a *mélange* of the public knowledge and ignorance, sense and folly, on all sides of all questions.

Meanwhile Mr. Collier himself,—no doubt remembering and duly appreciating the old saw which recommends that we should strike while the iron is hot,—has come forth with the second of the two volumes before us. Let us see, before we go farther, how much more than they had already paid for the possessors of the former volume have got for the additional guinea which any of them may have been tempted to expend upon the purchase of this second one.

We mean, of course, how much more they have thus acquired of the new matter contained in Mr. Collier's annotated folio, or at least of information respecting the large number of corrections of the common Shakespearian text said to be there indicated. For this must be supposed to have been alone what was wanted by the purchasers of both books. No doubt the general public might be very well pleased to receive a new edition of Shakespeare from Mr. Collier, compendiously printed in a single volume, and in all respects well and handsomely got up, as this must be admitted to be; but the present edition professes to be something altogether different from that. It may be affirmed to be distinctly put forward as *not* intended for the general public. The principle upon which it is expressly declared to be constructed implies that it is not to be taken as a popular but only as a critical edition, or rather an edition to subserve a certain critical purpose. It does not profess to give us what Mr. Collier himself believes that Shakespeare actually wrote, but what he is supposed or asserted to have written by the author of the manuscript alterations in the old Folio. "It is not to be understood," we are warned in the first sentence of the preface, "that the editor approves of all the changes in the text of the plays contained in the ensuing volume;" he only thinks that "the great majority of them assert a well-founded claim to a place in every future reprint of Shakespeare's Dramatic Works." And then, after remarking that the value and importance of not a few of the new readings have been admitted on all hands, he adds:—"The present volume has been published to satisfy an almost universal wish that they should be placed beyond the reach of destruction, and that all who desire it should be able to obtain a copy of the productions of our great dramatist, comprising the manuscript corrections recently discovered by the editor."

What, then, is it that we have a right to expect to find in an

edition professing such an object and such a principle? Turning to the Preface, or Introduction, which stands before the 'Notes and Emendations,' we there read the following account of the annotated folio:—

"Without adverting to sundry known mistakes of pagination, it may be stated that the entire volume consists of nearly 900 pages, divided between thirty-six plays; and, besides the correction of literal and verbal errors, as well as lapses of a graver and more extensive kind, the punctuation has been carefully set right throughout. As there is no page without from ten to thirty of these minor emendations, they do not, in the whole, fall short of 20,000: most of them have, of course, been introduced in modern editions, since the plain meaning of a passage often contradicts the old careless and absurd pointing; but it will be seen hereafter, that in not a few instances the sense of the poet has thus been elucidated in a way that has not been anticipated. With regard to changes of a different and more important character, where letters are added or expunged, where words are supplied or struck out, or where lines and sentences, omitted by the early printer, have been inserted, together with all other emendations of a similar kind, it is difficult to form any correct estimate of their number. The volume in the hands of the reader includes considerably more than a thousand of such alterations; but to have inserted all would have swelled its bulk to unreasonable dimensions, and would have wearied the patience of most persons, not merely by the sameness of the information, but by the monotony of the language in which it was necessarily conveyed."

Here, let it be observed in the first place, we have it stated that the changes made by the manuscript corrector of a more important character are so much more numerous than those produced in the volume of 'Notes and Emendations,' that to have inserted them all, besides being inconvenient or objectionable in another way, would have seriously increased the bulk of that volume. What was to be inferred from such a statement as this, except that the said volume was to be regarded as giving us at the most only a liberal sample of the new readings of importance found in the annotated folio, and that at least as many more as were there produced, if not a very much larger number, were passed over and reserved?

Yet what turns out to be the fact when we receive the subsequently published volume professing to comprise *all* the old annotator's new readings, as well those that are not, as those that are, approved of by its editor? The short Preface to the one volume edition of the plays does not contain a word which would warrant us in supposing that any of the annotator's alterations, certainly not that any of importance, have been withheld. It

professes, at any rate by implication, to be a complete representation of the text as he has reformed, or transformed, it. If it is not that, it is worthless; upon what other ground or pretence than that of fidelity of representation can alterations have been introduced which, in the opinion of the editor, are not improvements but perversions of the common text and falsifications of Shakespeare?

Neither of the reasons exists here which were alleged in the case of the preceding publication for confining the new readings there given to a mere selection. To print the whole would not have taken up any additional space, nor pressed more heavily either upon the wealth of the editor's synonymous vocabulary or upon the patience of his readers. It is, therefore, with no small surprise that we find the new readings, at least those of any importance, that are given in Mr. Collier's second publication to be, after all, no more and no other than we had already got in a different form in his first. If we rightly understand him, the one volume is, in so far as such differences from the common text are concerned, simply a repetition of the other. In the first we had, according to the assurance in the introduction, "considerably more than a thousand" changes upon the received text of a more important character; in the second the new readings that are duly inserted in their places are again described, in almost precisely the same words, as "considerably exceeding a thousand." It is observed, indeed, afterwards, that various alterations "have been introduced in the following sheets, which did not seem to require distinct and separate mention among the 'Notes and Emendations' recently published;" but these *additional* new readings, while they appear to be very few in number, we are at the same time expressly informed, are "most of them of a minor character." They belong, therefore, not to the same class with those formerly given, but to that of those then designated the "minor emendations," and calculated to amount to no fewer than 20,000. What is become of that reserved mass of alterations of an important character said to be found in the old folio, to have inserted all of which in the 'Notes and Emendations' would have swelled the bulk of that volume to such unreasonable dimensions?

Our perplexity is increased when we proceed to examine the only distinct evidence of what his annotated folio really is, and is not, with which Mr. Collier has favoured us. This is a lithographed *fac simile* of a portion of one of its pages. It is the same in both publications. The play from which it is selected is the *First Part of Henry VI.*; being, if we allow it to be Shakespeare's at all, certainly, of all those admitted into the common collections of his works, precisely the one that has the

least of his characteristic style and manner, and therefore one about the text of which less interest is felt than in the case of any other of the whole thirty-seven. "Our choice has been influenced," says Mr. Collier, "*not so much by the worth of the play, or by the value of the emendations, as by the circumstance that it includes, in the compass of an octavo page, examples of the manner in which corrections of nearly all kinds are made, from the insertion of a single letter to the addition of a line, omitted in all the Folios, together with the striking out of a passage not considered necessary for the performance.*" It is a slip of memory, by the bye, in the learned editor to describe the restored line here as new, or as not to be found in any of the Folios. In the body of the volume (at p. 274) it is rightly recognised as extant in the First Folio; and in fact it appears in all the modern editions, his own included. But what is most remarkable is, that this *fac simile* is neither in accordance with the printed text which professes to be founded upon it, nor can even fairly be said, we think, to bear out in all respects the account of the annotated old volume which it is produced to illustrate.

It comprehends about a third of one of the original pages, no one of which, we have been assured, is without from ten to thirty of those "minor emendations" which it was not thought necessary to notice in the exposition of the painstaking annotator's more illustrious labours. Now the entire number of manuscript alterations of all kinds which the specimen exhibits is by the most liberal calculation no more than ten, and seven of them are detailed in the 'Notes and Emendations.' Where, then, for this portion of the text are the other "changes of a more important character" the insertion of all of which in that volume would have so inconveniently increased its bulk, and added so greatly to the infliction upon its reader's powers of endurance? The other three corrections are merely the striking out of a mis-division of the scene, the insertion of a comma, and the noting of an omitted entrance. This is, apparently, one of the pages in which the "minor emendations" are at a minimum. Of the more important new readings, again, one, according to Mr. Collier, (in both his volumes), is the substitution for the words "most bloody" of "still bleeding." Possibly it may be the fault of the engraver, but the word as given in the plate is not *bleeding*, but *blooding*. The editor may be justified in assuming that the former word was what the annotator really wrote; but the circumstance should not have been passed over without explanation or notice. Finally, we come to a line which is different in the two folios: the manuscript annotator leaves it untouched as it stands in the Second; nevertheless Mr. Collier prints it in his new text, in common with other modern editors, in the form in which it appears in the

First. And how often the same thing may be done in other passages we have no means of knowing.

We cannot commend the method which Mr. Collier has thus chosen to pursue in dealing with his *treasure trove* as either the most scientific or the most satisfactory that might have been adopted. It is plain that we have nothing that can be called a full or fair representation of the annotated folio either in the *Notes and Emendations*, or in the new edition of the plays, or in both combined. We have some eleven or twelve hundred new readings enumerated in the one publication and inserted in their places in the other, and that is all. These are avowedly only a selection from the alterations made by the manuscript annotator. They may afford us, for aught that appears, only a very *partial* exposition of his obliterations and substitutions, in more than one sense of the word. Even if we are only expected to receive his new readings as conjectural, we ought to have them before us in their whole extent; we ought to have his less happy attempts as well as those that are thought to do more credit to his ingenuity and sagacity. We are hardly in a condition to pronounce upon his critical competency till we have his performances submitted to us in their integrity and general character, and not merely in certain picked instances. Nay, we ought to know not only what he has done but what he has left undone, what he has passed over that seemed to require reparation as well as what he has mended or tried to mend, what he has missed as well as what he has found. Still more important it becomes, for obvious reasons, that all this should be fully and distinctly set forth if the new readings are to claim an authoritative character, or an origin which would leave us nothing to examine or debate except the probabilities of their correct transcription. In that case the evidence bearing upon the question may lie almost as much in what they do not as in what they do include, in what of the old text is left untouched as in what is struck out or altered.

Although, however, Mr. Collier has not given us all the information of this kind that would have been desirable, nor so much as he might have put us in possession of by drawing up the account of his old folio after a different method, we are still not left altogether in the dark upon the points that have just been mentioned. We do not know all the cases in which the annotator has either applied his reforming hand unsuccessfully (in the opinion of his editor), or has passed over passages either probably or indisputably wrong without making any attempt to amend them; but we know that he has done both these things in some cases. Now, on the first consideration of the matter, that fact appears to be inconsistent with the supposition that he had any

authority for his corrections; for that, it may be thought, would have enabled him to restore every passage that was corrupted in the printed text. If any, still more if many, such passages are left untouched, can we suppose that he made his alterations under any better guidance than his own conjectural ingenuity, which, of course, while it might at any time lead him wrong as well as right, might sometimes fail to suggest any way of remedying the corruption, or even to detect its existence?

But, on the other hand, some of the emendations are, we must think, of so peculiar a character that they can hardly be thus accounted for. A good many of the new readings, we admit, are not such as we should be inclined to receive simply on their own showing. Some have a very doubtful, others a more than doubtful, look; a few may be almost certainly pronounced to be quite inadmissible. But not only are many so remarkable that it would probably be impossible to parallel the whole collection in point of plausibility by the conjectures of any other known reformer of the Shakespearian text, if indeed those of all the editors and commentators together would be found to outshine what we have received from this one anonymous annotator; not only so, but some of them seem to carry evidence in themselves that they could not have been the produce of mere conjecture. Mr. Collier, though hardly himself venturing to claim for them an authoritative character, has pointed out a very remarkable presumption which we have in at least one instance that the annotator proceeded upon something else than his own ingenuity. In the Second Scene of the Third Act of *Coriolanus* a speech of Volumentia in reply to her son stands thus amended:—

“ Pray be counselled.

I have a heart as little apt as yours
To brook control without the use of anger,
But yet a brain, that leads my use of anger
To better vantage.”

The line “To brook control without the use of anger” is wanting in the printed copies, and is supplied by the annotator. “It seems impossible,” as Mr. Collier observes, “to doubt the genuineness of this insertion, unless we go the length of pronouncing it not only an invention, but an invention of the utmost ingenuity; for, while it renders perfect the deficient sense, it shows at once what caused the error: the recurrence of the same words, ‘use of anger,’ at the end of two following lines deceived the old compositor, and induced him to fancy that he had already printed a line which he had excluded.” Every student of verbal criticism is familiar with what appears to have occasioned the

corruption in this instance, the *homœoteleuton*, as it is called, one of the most fertile sources of errors of omission both in printed books and in manuscripts.

But, independently of this curious piece of evidence, we confess we think it altogether unlikely that the old annotator would in any case have gone the length of actually adding to the text, which it seems he has done in at least nine different places, from the stores of his own invention. It is not to be supposed that a person who set himself such a task, and went through it with so much care and labour, could have had any other object or wish except to restore what Shakespeare wrote where it was lost or misrepresented in the printed editions; and he never could have imagined that he was doing that if, wherever a line seemed to be wanting, he deliberately inserted without any sort of notice or distinctive mark one fabricated by himself.

One of the insertions, we observe, has been objected to by Mr. Dyce in a little volume (full, like whatever comes from that quarter, of valuable matter) in which he has commented upon Mr. Collier's *Notes and Emendations*. It occurs in one of the speeches of Leontes in the concluding scene of *The Winter's Tale* :—

" Let be, let be !
Would I were dead, but that, methinks, already . — •
I am but dead, stone looking upon st ne.
What was he that did make it?" &c.

The line in *Italics* is supplied by the manuscript annotator. On first reading it, Mr. Dyce says, it appeared to him so exactly in the style of Shakespeare, that, like Mr. Collier, he felt "thankful that it had been furnished." "But presently," he adds, "I found that it was *too Shakespearean*." And then he quotes the exclamation of Leontes a few speeches before—

" Does not the stone rebuke me
For being more stone than it?"

and subjoins:—"Now, which is the greater probability—that Shakespeare (whose variety of expression was inexhaustible) repeated himself in the line, 'I am but dead, stone looking upon stone?' or that a reviser of the play (with an eye to the passage just cited) ingeniously constructed the said line, to fill up a supposed lacuna?" The answer is obvious.* There is no living person to whom we should more willingly entrust the text of Shakespeare than to Mr. Dyce; but here we cannot

* *A Few Notes on Shakespeare*, p. 82.

agree with him. His ultimate judgment on the inserted line, we cannot but think, has been biassed by some little natural feeling of partiality for his own imagined discovery. We do not question the inexhaustible variety of Shakespeare's expression whenever variety of expression is wanted. But in some cases repetition is far more expressive and more natural than any variety. And yet in the two passages which Mr. Dyce compares we have variety of expression too; it is only the thought, if any thing, which is the same in both. And such repetition is in the highest degree dramatic and beautiful; it is the one thought, the one feeling, which fills the mind of Leontes, and as such finds repeated utterance, it matters little or nothing whether in the same or in different words every time. In the very speech with which Mr. Dyce would confute the new reading, there stares us in the face, as the entire passage is exhibited in his own page, an instance of the very repetition to which he objects; only four lines after the words that have been already quoted from it we have the same idea again in the words "Standing like stone with thee." Is it to be argued that Shakespeare's inexhaustible variety of expression permitted him to repeat himself once, but never twice?

What then shall we say? How are we to account for and to reconcile the various and to some extent apparently contradictory characteristics of this remarkable collection of proposed alterations of the commonly received text of our great dramatist? Upon what hypothesis can we explain how it should have happened that the laborious and painstaking person to whom we are indebted for them, having the means, as he seems to have had, of ascertaining the true reading in some instances, should not have been able to do so in all, but on the contrary should sometimes have manifestly mistaken it, and in other cases should have passed over passages which there can hardly be a doubt are corrupt without even an attempt to correct them?

Some of the new readings which Mr. Collier has not hesitated to produce, (and we do not know how many more of the same kind may be kept back,) are certainly as bad as it is possible to conceive. Perhaps the worst of them all is the conversion, in Lady Macbeth's famous exclamation,—

"What beast was't, then,
That made you break this enterprize to me?"

of *beast* into *boast*, although it is an alteration which Mr. Collier not only accepts, but lauds and parades, both in his Notes and in his Preface, as almost of itself sufficient to command our acquiescence in every other proceeding from the same quarter.

We believe that this wonderful specimen has done more to discredit the authority of the old annotator than all other things taken together. Putting aside the question of taste, the new reading is nonsense. Where in Shakespeare or in any other writer, did Mr. Collier ever find the word *boast* used for a mental emotion or impulse? The very essence of its signification is the notion of *expression*. To talk of the boaster being made to do something by his own *boast* would be as absurd as to talk of a man being impelled to speak or to walk by his own speech or gait. If in this passage there could be any reasonable doubt (which we do not think there can be) of *beast* being the true word, there could be none whatever that *boast* is not.

Our hypothesis may be stated in a few words. It is substantially the same which we have already suggested as accounting for many of the errors in the First Folio, or rather it is a part of our former hypothesis, or supposition of what the facts may probably have been, applied to this other case. We believe that the old annotator must have had access to a text of the plays superior in correctness and in authority to that of the printed copies, and that from that source nearly all his new readings must have been drawn. It may have been the author's own manuscript, or some transcript from it in the possession of the players. It may have been the very same from which mainly the First Folio had been printed, perhaps thirty or forty years before. Even then, as has been already suggested, the papers to whose custody so much precious poetry had been confided may have seen a good deal of service; the handwriting may not have been at the best very distinct or easy to be read, and matters may have been made worse by its having in some places faded, or got otherwise partially obliterated; that would account for many of the mistakes and corruptions which we find in the printed text. When, so long afterwards, the same manuscripts come into the hands of the corrector of Mr. Collier's Second Folio, they have possibly suffered still more from the injuries of time and neglect; they may be still farther defaced, or even rubbed or eaten away; but he is not only, as is evident on any supposition, a person of superior intelligence and ingenuity, but one whose zeal for the restoration of the true Shakespearian text no amount of labour can daunt or tire; so that making his way through his task with all deliberation (he may have been years about it), he succeeds in deciphering aright many words which had baffled or been misread by the printers, and also in otherwise amending numerous passages which had been disfigured in various ways by the inattention to minute accuracy with which the printing of all popular literature was then executed. Nevertheless, there

are still some passages in which the manuscript is irrecoverably gone, or deceives even his patient and practised eye; in such cases his alterations may be unsatisfactory enough. He takes it into his head, for instance, that the word which has been printed *beast* is really *boast*; it is precisely the same mistake which, as we have seen, is made either by Mr. Collier himself or by his lithographer in regard to the word which the one gives as *bleeding*, the other as *blooding*. Or, now and then, he supplies a word or two of which no trace remains, or where perhaps he is wrong in imagining that there is any thing wanting, by mere conjecture; and there again he is possibly not very happy. It is not necessary to suppose that he was gifted with much poetical faculty, or even that his critical discernment was of the highest order. We certainly would entirely acquit him of any such forgery as that which Mr. Dyce is disposed to lay to his charge in the case of the lines—

“ Would I were dead, but that, methinks, already
I am but dead, stone looking upon stone.”

This is, in its way, surely as Shakespearian as any thing in all Shakespeare.

ART. II.—*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Rev. J. S. HOWSON, M.A., Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool. 2 vols. London, 1852.

SOME years ago we sketched the progress of Biblical Literature in Scotland.* The appearance of the book whose title is prefixed to this article inclines us to introduce it to the notice of our readers, in connexion with a hasty survey of the recent course and present condition of this study in the Church of England. It can hardly be denied that less has been done towards Biblical research on the northern than on the southern bank of the Tweed. Classical scholarship has been notoriously more encouraged in England than in Scotland; and good scholarship is the foundation of good Biblical exegesis. Professor Blackie, of the University of Edinburgh, has made some instructive remarks on this subject in an able inaugural lecture lately published, which we hope will incite the guides of Scottish theology to a deeper sense of their responsibility in this matter. "The Scottish Presbyterian Church," he remarks, "has for ages maintained a high character among the Churches of Christendom, with very little assistance from Greek: a character for earnest assiduity in the cure of souls, and an energetic power in the weekly demonstrations of pulpit eloquence, which more erudite Churches may with good reason envy. . . . But to the construction of the edifice, [of Christian theology,] next to profound personal piety and common sense, (an element in this matter too often lost sight of,) is necessary, above all things, a genuine sympathy with the spirit of ancient literature, and a practical acquaintance with those canons of interpretation, which are deduced from an accurate philology, a judicious criticism, and a large human philosophy. I need offend no one when I speak the plain truth, that such a theology, though imperatively demanded by the present age, has not hitherto been very common in Scotland; and this, among other reasons, I believe, in a great measure from the want of Greek."†

On the other hand, it is equally true, that if Scottish Presbyterians have neglected their duty in this respect, the English Church and Universities, with their ample resources, have been

* See *North British Review* for May 1845.

† Blackie's Inaugural Lecture.—"Classical Literature in its Relation to the Nineteenth Century and Scottish University Education" Edinburgh, 1852.

by no means immaculate. For it is within a comparatively recent period that the Church of England has been roused to a consciousness of the extent to which the critical and exegetical study of the New Testament has generally been neglected. The evil began at the Universities. It is not too much to say, that till lately no attempt was made to enforce upon students any real acquaintance with the origin and design of the various books of Scripture, or even the meaning of difficult or disputed passages. In the examination for the B.A. degree at Oxford, there has, indeed, long been a somewhat rigorous inquiry into the facts of the sacred history, but questions on the interpretation of the text are comparatively rare. Let any one look through the files of theological papers in the University library at Cambridge, and he will find plenty of questions about points of archæology and doctrine; heretics are held up to reprobation; the Jewish feasts, the seven deacons, the family history of Herod and Mariamne, the institution of Episcopacy, the first four Councils, types real or imaginary, the antiquity and independence of the Church in Britain, all furnish matter for inquiry more or less pertinent to the Gospels and the Acts; but the accurate explanation of passages was till lately almost neglected. Undergraduates were indeed desired to "rescue" one text from the Papist, another from the Presbyterian, a third from the Calvinist, a fourth from the Socinian;* but when translations and explanations were required, they were generally of what were irreverently denominated "cram" pieces, *i.e.*, certain passages annually selected as tests of undergraduate orthodoxy, while no encouragement was given to the real interpretation of the text on philological and exegetical principles. Moreover, to these papers in the Greek Testament no importance was attached, and they were generally looked down upon by the distinguished scholars and mathematicians of the year.

It was about twenty years ago that these deficiencies were pressed upon public notice, by the controversy which raged in the University about the admission of Dissenters. Those who were in residence at that time still speak of the sensation excited among the wondering undergraduates of Trinity College, when the present Bishop of St. David's made his appearance in hall without the college cap, which is the distinctive mark of the tutorial office, having been requested by the then Master to resign, in consequence of his pamphlet on the great subject of the day. In that pamphlet, besides objecting to compulsory attendance at chapel, the Bishop, then Mr. Thirlwall, had asserted

* See a Pamphlet by Dr. C. Wordsworth, "*On the Admission of Dissenters*," &c. 1834, p. 21.

the absolute nullity of the theological instruction given in the Colleges at Cambridge. In his own it was proved that effective divinity lectures had only been delivered for about a year. Even on these attendance was voluntary; nor had the subjects extended beyond the Acts of the Apostles and White's Diatessaron, the substitution of that compendium for the original Gospels being a sufficient proof that all critical inquiry into their contents was impossible. All candid men who read the pamphlets which then covered Deighton's counter will probably agree, that whatever other objections might be found to Mr. Thirlwall's views and proposals, he was completely successful in shewing that the theological teaching at Cambridge was a mere "sham," and that points of history, chronology, and antiquities, formed the staple of the so-called divinity examinations.

Though little else resulted from the "Dissenter Controversy," as it was styled, we consider that it bore important fruit in the attention which it roused to this subject. Men began to ask whether an intelligent acquaintance with the New Testament might not be expected from every graduate of a University which pre-eminently claimed the name of Christian, and which shared with one sister only the privilege of supplying nearly all the ministers of the English Church. Additions were made to the divinity examinations connected with the ordinary degree. The existence of the Epistles was recognised, and "one of the longer or two of the shorter" were exacted from every candidate, who was not considered to be elevated by the splendour of his mathematical attainments above the necessity of acquiring this small modicum of Christian knowledge. Yet even the "honour-men" were attacked by graces and syndicates, and some people thought that a knowledge of the differential calculus would not be less valuable if accompanied by a comprehension of those documents on which our faith is founded. This part of the question has indeed resulted for the present in a scarcely credible absurdity, and leaves to Cambridge the distinction of sanctioning the grossest farce of the nineteenth century. The attendance of candidates for honours is exacted during the theological part of the ordinary examination, but *they are not required to answer any questions!* After sitting for about half an hour without putting pen to paper they disperse to more attractive occupations. We quite admit that *at the time* of the mathematical examination it would be unfair to call on embryo wranglers to interpret difficult passages in St. Paul's Epistles; but why does not the University apply the obvious remedy of requiring this important knowledge to be produced at some other period of an undergraduate's career?

In some of the Colleges, especially in Trinity, other improve-

ments have been introduced. Prizes of considerable value are given for proficiency in the knowledge of the Greek Testament. Lectures are delivered on the Epistles. Last year those on the *Romans* were given by one of the most distinguished scholars among the assistant tutors. Everything seems to indicate that the University is awake to the importance of biblical studies, and we all know that when Cambridge has resolved on carrying out any particular work, she seldom does it by halves. At Oxford too, the Epistles of St. Paul are formally sanctioned as a book for examination in the altered school of *Litteræ Humaniores*, and even before the recent changes, there was at least one instance of a first-class candidate presenting it as part of his work. The exegetical professorship, the last and greatest of Dean Ireland's benefactions to his University, will, we hope, some day be worthily and efficiently used for the great end of its foundation, though such an expectation can hardly be entertained during the incumbency of the present professor. In each of the Reports from her Majesty's Commissioners for inquiring into the state of the Universities, the importance of systematizing and extending the study of theology is fully recognised, and several improvements are suggested, which will, we hope, if carried out, have a great and lasting effect on the welfare of the Church at large.

For let no one think that the ignorance of the Greek Testament which was permitted at the Universities was afterwards remedied elsewhere. No attempt, for instance, was made to supply it by the knowledge required in the Episcopal examinations for orders. In these perhaps there was less archæology and more doctrine, but such books as Pearson on the Creed, Burnet on the Articles, in some cases Tomline's wretched compilations, received far more attention than the Epistles of St. Paul. Many Bishops did not even expect a knowledge of the great Apostle's writings from candidates for the diaconate; apparently considering that the duty of preaching and the whole care of a parish might be properly entrusted to a person whose study of the Bible had stopped with the last chapter of the Acts. At the examination for priest's orders indeed, the candidate was generally required to construe a passage from an Epistle *visâ voce*, but little more was expected than that he should remember the English version, and take the words in their grammatical connexion. But here again important improvements are now going on. Candidates from Cambridge are almost always required to pass the so called *Voluntary Theological*—voluntary as far as the University is concerned, but compulsory on the side of the Bishops. For this examination, we rejoice to see that the whole of the Greek Testament is the very first requisite. Some Bishops go farther than this, and inquire themselves with considerable

care into the candidate's acquaintance with this foundation of all theological study. No one who remembers Mr. Lee's Greek Testament lessons at Rugby or Birmingham, can think without some sympathy of the sufferings of a would-be deacon, when examined *virâ voce* in an epistle of St. Paul by the Bishop of Manchester.

The consequences of the neglect which we have described were in many respects disastrous. The least of them, perhaps, is the gross misinterpretation of passages which we occasionally hear in sermons. Such is the monstrous application of the passage, (Rom. xiv. 23,) *Whatever is not of faith, is sin*, (meaning that any action of whose lawfulness we are not fully convinced, is in our case sinful,) to prove the 13th Article of the English Church that works done before justification have the nature of sin. But this habit of detaching passages from their context, and quoting them without any definite principles of interpretation, has produced far wider evils than this. It has been a fruitful source of profitless disputation and serious theological error. Take, for example, one of the most essential points of Christian belief, the doctrine concerning our Lord's person. To argue on this by isolated texts and quotations is a useless labour, for any of those on which the Trinitarian most relies, may be met by others, which, when taken alone, seem favourable to the Unitarian ~~creed~~. But let a man read with intelligence and honesty, and with the necessary explanations, the whole gospel of St. John, or one of St. Paul's Epistles, such as that to the Colossians; let him study the circumstances under which they were written, and the meaning of the language which they employ, and it will be impossible for him to maintain that St. Paul or St. John believed in the mere humanity of Christ. This is remarkably illustrated by the case of Coleridge, who in his youth held Socinian opinions, not because he imagined that these two Apostles countenanced them, which he clearly saw that they did not, but because he denied their authority, and considered them mistaken. And so in many other cases, when Scripture is fairly studied and interpreted, we cannot doubt that among those at least who accept it as the rule of faith, there will be far closer agreement than there is now. We may hope, too, that some who now seek in the Romish Church an infallible interpreter of matters which seem to them obscure and contradictory, will find that Scripture itself, when read with the ordinary care which we bestow on any book of merely human authority, becomes its own expositor; that as God's Holy Spirit often guides men, in spite of much intellectual error, to the perception of what is essential in the Christian religion, so also an honest use of the faculties and means of exposition which God has given them, will save them from that intellectual error which now dims even their spiritual vision. They will find

that they can understand the doctrine of St. Paul without seeking enlightenment from the *lumen siccum* which is kindled on the altars of our Lady of Salette.

Another result of this early neglect of exegetical study has been the lamentable dearth of English literature on this subject. Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ* was indeed a masterly contribution to it for a particular purpose, and might well have suggested to better scholars than Paley, some true principles of exegesis. But since the publication of that most able work, there has been, till recently, a real famine in the land. Even when so accomplished a theologian as Dr. Burton sat down to edit the Greek Testament, the result was meagre in the extreme. Whatever may be the merits of Dr. Bloomfield as an editor of Thucydides, he has brought no qualification but learning to bear upon St. Paul. As to the attempts which have been made to popularize the interpretation of Scripture, and to make it intelligible to the unlearned classes, most persons are agreed that the sooner Doyley and Mant are consigned to the tomb of the Capulets the better. That such a book as Bishop Shuttleworth's *Paraphrastic Translation of the Epistles* should have gone through four editions, is a proof how much the want was felt, though we may well compassionate those who accepted such dry bones as nutritious food. In 1832 the late Professor Scholefield published *Hints for an improved translation of the New Testament*, with a comprehensive dedication to the Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and candidates for holy orders in the Church of England. We desire to pass over as lightly as possible the shortcomings of one who laboured so earnestly, and did so much good as a parish priest in the town of Cambridge, as Mr. Scholefield. Nor do we think that a Greek Professor is at all required to desert the study of Classical for that of Hellenistic Greek. But when a person holding so exalted a position does publish on such a subject, he is bound to put forth something worth reading. Yet the book before us is absolutely puerile. The following note is no unfair specimen of the amount of boldness in Mr. Scholefield's criticisms, and the limit to which he thought that exegesis might be justifiably carried:—

"Heb. iv. 8. *Jesus*. 'Ἰησοῦς. 'Joshua'. Whether such a rendering would be consistent with the duty of a faithful translator, may perhaps be questioned. But it is to be considered that our translation after all is made for English readers, the great bulk of whom . . . are hopelessly perplexed about the assertion here made of *Jesus*. . . . As a practical question, therefore, in which the spiritual welfare of millions is more or less concerned, it may be worth while to consider whether the change would not be justifiable," &c., &c.

But meantime, while England was silent, another nation of kindred origin but different habits of mind, had begun to speak out. For many years the German press has been literally teeming with exegesis. Besides separate commentaries of various merit, a periodical publication, the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, has contained papers on different points of criticism from some of the ablest divines of the day. That much of the German interpretation of Scripture has been false and mischievous, that there is scarcely any monstrous opinion which has not been promulgated, defended, opposed, withdrawn, refuted by Germans, is undeniable. From this fact many well-meaning persons have tried to discountenance the study of these writers altogether, mixing together in indiscriminate condemnation the most earnest Christians, and the most unbelieving rationalists. A ludicrous example of this is said to have been given in the sermon of a late head of a college at Oxford, who, as the story goes, expressed his wish from St. Mary's pulpit, that "German metaphysics and German theology were at the bottom of the German Ocean." More serious were the anathemas of a recent assailant of Archdeacon Hare, who buried under one indiscriminate execration "Kant, Fichte, Schleiermacher, Strauss, Neander, Paulus," &c. These are specimens of the tendencies of a number of writers and preachers, who, though not particularly harmonious on other points, agree in suspecting everybody supposed to favour the obnoxious nation, till even the knowledge of German is sometimes regarded as a symptom of heresy. On the other hand, there have not been wanting members of the English Church who have felt that even if the theology of Germany were only a huge mass of corruption, yet considering its far-extended influence, any man who attempts to ignore it, is like the ostrich thrusting its head into the sand, in the agreeable delusion, that as he cannot see the hunters, neither can they see him. It has long been obvious that, unless we can establish a theological *cordon sanitaire*, we cannot exclude it, and it may be added, that if we were to do so, we should deprive ourselves of a most important help to understand Scripture; of the best instrument (next to an earnest Christian heart) for maintaining our countrymen's faith in divine revelation, which the feeble criticism now current in England cannot support; and of many treasures of religious thought and earnest piety. Rather is it our duty, convinced that our Lord's promise to His Church is as sure as ever, to welcome every help which we can procure towards the interpretation of His Word, and while we lament the evils which pollute the present theological movement in Germany, to regret still more the sluggish apathy into which we ourselves have fallen.

Nor are such convictions as these confined to what a witty compatriot* of our own has recently designated the *Broad Church* School of English divinity. The introduction of German theology into England is indeed due to various causes. It results partly from the general attention drawn to the writings of our Teutonic brethren, by their great discoveries in history, philology, and classical literature. The works of Coleridge drew attention to the metaphysics of Germany, and the transition from philosophy to theology is easy. But still it is remarkable, that the first elaborate defence of German divines proceeded from the pen of Dr. Pusey, who though he has retracted his book, has not refuted his arguments. The first translator of Neander was Mr. Henry Rose, and although the readers of his translation are disturbed by the somewhat absurd effect of a running commentary at the foot of each page, arguing against the views of Episcopacy propounded in the text, yet he would hardly have rendered it into English, if he had not seen that the work was a rich mine of Christian learning. But the party usually called *Anglican* were otherwise instrumental in introducing German divinity into England. When they asserted that without the Church Scripture was unintelligible, that no man could find the way of salvation from the sacred volume only, without listening to the voice of authority and tradition, which had fixed its meaning, or developed new doctrines from its statements, people began to inquire whether these writings which God has bestowed on man to be the guide of his moral and religious life, are really different in kind from all other books, so that even by an honest use of our faculties (themselves also God's gift) we cannot understand the words which prophets and apostles were commissioned to write? No doubt to apply them to the direction of our own hearts and lives, is the work of a higher power than either the Church or the human understanding; this can only be done by the help and blessing of God's Holy Spirit. But to understand the meaning of the documents themselves, to solve the various questions about their authorship, the particular object of each, the time and circumstances under which they were written; to translate, to explain, to settle the text, this surely falls within the province of the human intellect. Therefore we are right in searching for the best helps which learning and scholarship can give us; we are not justified in neglecting the writings of those who at present at least are pre-eminent in their acquaintance with the language of Scripture, and the literature connected with it. We should not of course reject the helps offered by the Fathers and ancient

commentators on the Bible. To do this would be one-sided and narrow-minded in another way; but to confine ourselves to them is as absurd as to refuse the aid of Arnold and Poppo in reading Thucydides, and to limit our attention to the scholiast. We allow that to understand the Scriptures is a plain and obvious duty, but we are only beginning to appreciate the truth of the remark, that men "with the very best intentions interpret St. Paul no better than they would interpret Aristotle, and for the same reason, because they do not sufficiently exercise and cultivate their minds to become masters of the meaning of a profound and difficult writer."*

However, it is quite plain that we have no alternative between understanding the Bible for ourselves, and accepting the authoritative interpretations of Rome. We do not maintain that every simple Scotch and English peasant must be familiar with Olshausen and Neander; but as education advances, it is clear that even Scotch and English peasants will expect the ministers of the Gospel to explain Scripture with a far stricter accuracy, and a far more intelligent interpretation, than that with which they are contented now. Meantime we have only to point to the fact, that multitudes of working-men are constantly imbibing infidelity from the pages of Strauss, and the "open counsel" of the *Leader*, to make it quite clear that those who wish to save them must no longer shut their eyes to the plain facts around them. We hail, therefore, with intense satisfaction, the appearance of any books on the criticism and interpretation of Scripture, written by men who are at once good Christians, good scholars, and acquainted with the results of modern no less than of ancient inquiry. We regard such books as far more valuable than any number of translations from the works of German writers: for a German professor has rarely the faculty of writing in an interesting and attractive style; the play of his fancy seems stifled by tobacco, by the close stove and unopened windows of his study, and by want of exercise and fresh air; his line of speculation is often far removed from English habits and feeling; he is essentially unpractical. Again, their works, like all others, suffer when transferred from their native language, and particularly in the hands of an unskilful translator. A long sentence, cumbrous and ponderous in the original German, becomes in English absolutely intolerable. Many translators too have adopted a habit of anglicizing certain German expressions, (*stund-point, pragmatistical, &c.*) so that to a person unacquainted with the original language, the versions of German divines now current are often a mass of the strangest

* Arnold, Introduction to Vol. iii. of *Sermons*.

gibberish. The constant references to writers of their own country, the refutations of absurd opinions there prevalent, but here unknown, make the study of these books to an Englishman still more unattractive. Besides this, it is lamentable if a Church with such peculiar facilities for maintaining a learned clergy as that of England, aided by a large number of other Christian bodies, whose ministers are remarkable for intelligence and earnest religion, can train up nothing better than a race of mere translators. We therefore regard with hope and satisfaction, not translations, but original works; and these we are happy to see are increasing both in number and importance. Pre-eminent are the sermons of Archdeacon Hare on the *Mission of the Comforter*, containing as they do, not only exegetical commentaries of the highest value on points of detail, but also a masterly general exposition of the most solemn and important promises in Scripture.* Mr. Trench's works on the *Parables* and *Miracles*, are storehouses of ancient and modern learning, adorned by the earnest piety of a devout Christian, and by the practical knowledge and good sense of a scholarlike Englishman. Mr. Stanley's *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age* are remarkable for originality of investigation, eloquence of language, and for their vivid picture of the characters of the Apostles, and condition of the early Church. In Mr. Alford's *Greek Testament*, we certainly regret the somewhat ungenerous practice of unnecessarily dragging to light, and then denouncing, perhaps with a note of admiration (or consternation!) some of the more extravagant theories of certain German critics, on whose sounder interpretations his own commentary is principally founded. Still it deserves great praise for honesty and boldness, as well as for research, and is far superior to any edition of the Greek Testament which has yet appeared in England. We must pass over some other publications of less importance, and turn at once to the work whose title stands at the head of this Article, and which may well take its place among those which are likely most largely to contribute to the promotion of these studies in England.

We feel that we owe our readers a double apology, first, for having so long delayed our notice of this important work; and, secondly, at the very time when we are professing to review it, for detaining them with such a prolix introduction on general subjects. For the former fault, we must ask them to accept this Article as a proof of a practical though tardy repentance; and for the latter, we can only say that it is impossible properly

* When may we look for the promised notes on the *Victory of Faith*, which no doubt are equally valuable?

to appreciate the value of Messrs. Conybeare and Howson's undertaking, unless we consider it in its relation to the barrenness of the past, and as an earnest of better things for the future. Although the two friends who have united in consecrating their ability and leisure to a work so worthy of the Christian minister's calling, have evidently availed themselves largely of German investigations, yet the one has brought to bear on it the fruits of sound English scholarship, and the other most extensive historical and geographical research. The general design will be gathered from the introduction.

"In order to present any thing like a living picture of St. Paul's career, much more is necessary than a mere transcript of the Scriptural narrative, even where it is fullest. Every step of his course brings us into contact with some new phase of ancient life, unfamiliar to our modern experience, and upon which we must throw light from other sources, if we wish to form a distinct image in the mind. For example, to comprehend the influences under which he grew to manhood, we must realize the position of a Jewish family in Tarsus, 'the chief city in Cilicia;' we must understand the kind of education which the son of such a family would receive as a boy in his Hebrew home, or in the schools of his native city, and in his riper youth 'at the feet of Gamaliel' in Jerusalem; we must be acquainted with the profession for which he was to be prepared by this training, and appreciate the station and duties of an expounder of the Law. And that we may be fully qualified to do all this, we should have a clear view of the state of the Roman empire at the time, and especially of its system in the provinces; we should also understand the political position of the Jews of the 'dispersion,' we should be (so to speak) hearers in their synagogues; we should be students of their Rabbinical theology. And in like manner, as we follow the Apostle in the different stages of his varied and adventurous career, we must strive continually to bring out in their true brightness the half-effaced forms and colouring of the scene in which he acts; and while he 'becomes all things to all men, that he might by all means save some,' we must form to ourselves a living likeness of the *things* and of the *men* among which he moved, if we would rightly estimate his work. Thus we must study Christianity rising in the midst of Judaism, we must realize the position of its early churches with their mixed society, to which Jews, Proselytes, and Heathens had each contributed a characteristic element; we must qualify ourselves to be umpires (if we may so speak) in their violent internal divisions; we must listen to the strifes of their schismatic parties, when one said 'I am of Paul, and another I am of Apollos,' we must study the true character of those early heresies which even denied the resurrection, and advocated impurity and lawlessness, claiming the right to sin 'that grace might abound,' 'defiling the mind and conscience' of their followers, and 'making them abominable and disobedient, and to every good work reprobate;' we must trace the extent to which Greek

philosophy, Judaizing formalism, and Eastern superstition, blended their tainting influence with the pure fermentation of the new leaven which was at last to leaven the whole mass of civilized society."—Vol. i. pp. lii. iv.

In addition to these qualifications for a right understanding of St. Paul's life, Mr. Conybeare then enumerates various other items of requisite knowledge, as to the places which the Apostle visited, their scenery, history, and principal characteristics, and to these, of course, must be added the correct interpretation of his writings. Speaking generally, Mr. Conybeare has contributed the translations and explanations of the letters and speeches; Mr. Howson the main part of the descriptive and historical chapters. But this division is not strictly accurate, for Mr. Conybeare, as we shall see, has undertaken portions of the work which would strictly have fallen to his coadjutor's share.

It is plainly impossible, in the compass of a single article, to give any thing like an analysis of a work so varied and rich in illustration as this. Indeed the chief fault which we have to find with Mr. Howson's chapters is, that they are overlaid with miscellaneous learning, to an extent which sometimes distracts the reader from the narrative and subject before him. To almost every event some modern parallel is found. The highlanders of Switzerland and Scotland, Louis Philippe, Lord Exmouth, Marshal Bugeaud, the Rajah of Bahawalpoor, Bishop Wilberforce, Abd-el-Kader, the Nabob of Oude, Mehemet Ali, the Scotists and the Thomists, the Duke of Sutherland, the Carlovingian Kings, the author of Eothen viewing Samothrace, are a very few of the various persons introduced to illustrate the earlier life of St. Paul. We are not allowed to pass through Cilicia without some appropriate and some superfluous information on Cicero's proconsulship; the fact that Saul was consenting to Stephen's death, introduces a notice of a picture by Vicente Joannes, with a brief account of the painter in a note; St. Peter's imprisonment is illustrated by allusions to the Church of San Pietro in Vincoli at Rome, and the Chapel of the Tower of London, (with references to Macaulay's History and Cunningham's Handbook;) Cleon, Brasidas and Paulus Æmilius appear *apropos* of Amphipolis, and scarcely a town is mentioned, however cursorily in the Acts, without a sketch of its previous and subsequent fortunes. Again, we feel disposed to object to the excessive straining after picturesque and graphic narration, visible throughout these chapters. With the facts recorded in Scripture or profane history, Mr. Howson mingles suppositions of his own, intended to give effect and reality to the narrative, but often hardly consistent with the seriousness and grandeur of his subject. Speculations as to St. Paul's earliest education,

and by fixing him at a "noisy Jewish school attached to some synagogue," illustrated by a description of a similar Mahometan seminary at Blidah in Algeria. He is supposed to have left Tarsus for Jerusalem in a Phœnician trader under the patronage of the gods of Tyre, and his feelings on first seeing Lebanon are described; while we are not only told that he probably landed at Casarea, but that fifty years before he would have gone to Ptolemais. The mere supposition that he passed by Sychar on his way to Damascus, introduces the extraordinary hypothesis, that the woman who met our Lord at Jacob's well, was again there when St. Paul passed. Considering that there is no allusion to natural scenery throughout his writings, we can hardly think it appropriate to represent him as constantly meditating on the landscapes through which he travels. And the following sentence seems surely better suited for one of Mr. James's Romances, or the imaginative histories of Lamartine, than a sober narrative of an Apostle's labours:—

"It was probably already winter, when St. Paul once more beheld in the distance the lofty citadel of Corinth, towering above the isthmus which it commands. The gloomy season must have harmonized well with his feelings as he approached. The clouds which hung round the summit of the Acrocorinthus, and cast their shadow upon the city below, typified the mists of error and vice, which darkened the minds even of its Christian citizens."—Vol. ii. p. 131.

Among these needless illustrations, we must enumerate unauthorized legends, not particularly striking in themselves, and liable to create a mischievous confusion with the Scriptural narrative. Such is the story that "St. Mary was standing on a rock when St. Stephen was stoned;" and such again is an absurd Roman Catholic fiction about "St. Thekla of Iconium," which is not only extravagantly grotesque, (containing for instance the assertion that among other prodigies which attended her attempted martyrdom, the sea monsters (*φῶκαι*) died when she was thrown into the water, and floated to the surface,) but seems to suggest thoughts which should not be brought into contact with the characters and events of the New Testament,—Vol. i. p. 197.

We have ventured to make these criticisms on the style and manner of Mr. Howson's narrative, but we should be sorry if we have said a word to detract from the surpassing merit of his work, which is indeed so marked by careful minuteness and enthusiasm for his subject, that it may well be called a labour of love. For interesting descriptions of the scenery in Greece and Asia Minor, for accurate discussions of doubtful points in the chronology or antiquities of the Acts, for varied information on

the places visited, the customs, laws, and institutions, to which incidental allusion is made, and above all, for the strain of Christian piety pervading the whole, his contributions to the work are worthy of all admiration. We would notice as especially valuable, the chapter on the political divisions and geography of Asia Minor, containing the description of the mountain passes which St. Paul and Silas traversed between Cilicia and Lycaonia; and the whole account of the voyage and shipwreck, which, though founded on the well-known work of Mr. Smith of Jordanhill, is yet worked up with so much care, and illustrated with so much new matter, that it may almost be called original. It is, besides, adorned with descriptive passages of such merit, that the whole 27th chapter of the Acts is brought freshly and vividly before us, in a manner which no ordinary reader of the Scriptural narrative can appreciate. We should have naturally selected several passages of different kinds, as examples of Mr. Howson's varied powers. But as we believe that many of our readers are not unacquainted with the volumes before us, we will content ourselves with merely reminding them of the very striking reflections on Stephen's death, and its effect upon Saul; and passing over many other interesting passages, confine ourselves to the following extract from the account of the storm, as a specimen of illustrative and descriptive writing:—

“No one who has never been in a leaking ship in a long continued gale can know what is suffered under such circumstances. The strain both of mind and body—the incessant demand for the labour of all the crew—the terror of the passengers—the hopeless working at the pumps—the labouring of the ship's frame and cordage—the driving of the storm—the benumbing effect of the cold and wet,—make up a scene of no ordinary confusion, anxiety, and fatigue. But in the present case these evils were much aggravated by the continued overclouding of the sky, (a circumstance not unusual during a Levanter,) which prevented the navigators from taking the necessary observations of the heavenly bodies. In a modern ship, however dark the weather might be, there would always be a light in the binnacle, and the ship's course would always be known: but in an ancient vessel, ‘when neither sun nor stars were seen for many days,’ the case would be far more hopeless. It was impossible to know how near they might be to the most dangerous coast. And yet the worst danger was that which arose from the leaky state of the vessel. This was so bad, that at length they gave up all hope of being saved, thinking that nothing could prevent her foundering. To this despair was added a further suffering from want of food, in consequence of the injury done to the provisions, and the impossibility of preparing any regular meal. Hence we see the force of the phrase which alludes to what a casual reader might suppose an unimportant part of the suffering, the fact that there

was 'much abstinence.' It was in this time of utter weariness and despair that to the Apostle there rose up 'light in the darkness:' and that light was made the means of encouraging and saving the rest. While the heathen sailors were vainly struggling to subdue the leak, Paul was praying; and God granted to him the lives of all who sailed with him. A vision was vouchsafed to him in the night, as formerly, when he was on the eve of conveying the Gospel from Asia to Europe, and more recently in the midst of those harassing events, which resulted in his voyage from Jerusalem to Rome. When the cheerless day came, he gathered the sailors round him on the deck of the labouring vessel, and, raising his voice above the storm, said :"

And then follows a translation (by Mr. Conybeare) of his address to them.*

Mr. Conybeare's contributions to the work are of a different character. While Mr. Howson's most important labours are geographical, those of his coadjutor are mainly exegetical. They consist of a semi-paraphrastic translation of the speeches and Epistles, with brief notes and explanations. The character of this translation we will describe in his own words. After declaring the necessity of altering positive errors in the authorized version, and his own unwillingness to provoke a contrast between its matchless style and that of a modern translator, by simply correcting such passages and retaining the authorized translation wherever it is correct and clear, he adds :—

"In order to give the true meaning of the original, something of paraphrase is often absolutely required. St. Paul's style is extremely elliptical, and the gaps must be filled up. And, moreover, the great difficulty in understanding his argument is to trace clearly the transitions by which he passes from one step to another. . . . For these reasons, the translation of the Epistles adopted in this work is to a certain degree paraphrastic. At the same time nothing has been added by way of paraphrase which was not virtually expressed in the original."—Vol. i. p. xiv.

Although we object to some of the phrases used in the translation, (such as the unnatural and useless substitution of *Glad tidings* for *Gospel*,) yet the style in which Mr. Conybeare has executed his task, if not always absolutely satisfactory, is such as no one

* In connexion with this part of our subject, we will mention an interesting anecdote, furnished to Mr. Howson from a private source, and which we gladly admit as a legitimate introduction of a modern illustration of Scriptural narrative. After explaining why the ship was anchored by the stern rather than in the usual way, Mr. Howson adds to some cases where this has been done in recent times :— "There is still greater interest in quoting the instance of Copenhagen, not only from the accounts we have of the precision with which each ship let go her anchor's astern, as she arrived nearly opposite her appointed station, but because it is said that Nelson stated after the battle, that he had that morning been reading the 27th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles."—Vol. ii. p. 345.

should venture to criticise till he himself has tested the exceeding difficulty of such a work. No doubt scholars will differ occasionally from the exegesis of the translation and notes, yet for general readers they positively bring light out of darkness in very many places, and enable them to understand each Epistle as a connected whole, in a manner which, to the best of our knowledge, is done in no other existing work. We will not crowd our pages with instances where the authorized version has been corrected, or rendered intelligible by Mr. Conybeare, nor will we quote passages which have been often discussed before, but we will simply notice three or four passages, either for the novelty, the ingenuity, or the doubtfulness of his suggestions.

1 Cor. xiv. 18. εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου, πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον ἢ γλώσση λαλῶ. Authorized version.—*I thank my God, I speak in tongues more than you all.* Conybeare.—*I offer thanksgivings to God in private, speaking in tongues to Him more than you all.* There is no doubt that Mr. Conybeare is right, though the reading λαλῶν (adopted by Scholz and De Wette) rests on inferior MS. authority to that which supports λαλῶ. The latter is the reading of the Vatican and Cambridge, and other important MSS.; and is preferred by Lachmann and Tischendorf. But whichever we choose, the authorized version must be wrong, for that εὐχαριστῶ refers generally to offering solemn thanksgiving to God, and is not a mere expression of thankfulness for the power of speaking with tongues, is plain from the whole context of the passage, and from the use of εὐλογεῖν and εὐχαριστεῖν in verses 16, 17. The addition, implying that St. Paul reserved his gift of tongues for his own private use, instead of displaying it in the Church, is justified by verse 28, "*Let him keep silence in the Church, and let him speak to himself* (ἐαυτῷ λαλεῖτω) *and to God.*"

Phil. i. 21. Ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος· εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί, τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου καὶ τί αἰρήσομαι, οὐ γνωρίζω. This passage has long been a *crux* to expositors, and we confess ourselves dissatisfied with Mr. Conybeare's translation. It stands thus—"For to me life is Christ, and death is gain. But whether this life in the flesh shall be the fruit of my labour, and what I should choose, I know not." And he attempts to justify it by the following note:—

"We punctuate this very difficult verse thus—*εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκὶ τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου, καὶ τί αἰρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω.* Lit. *But, whether this life in the flesh* (compare τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο, 1 Cor. xv. 54, and ἡ γὰρ ζωὴ ἐν σαρκί, Gal. ii. 20) *be my labour's fruit, and what I shall choose I know not.* The authorized version assumes an ellipsis after *σαρκί*, of *μοι πρέπειται*,

or something equivalent, and gives no intelligible meaning to *καρπὸς ἔργου*. On the other, De Wette's translation, *if life in the flesh,—if this be my labour's fruit, what I shall choose I know not*, makes the *καί* redundant, (which is not justified by the example which he quotes, 2 Cor. iv. 2, where *καί τις* is an emphatic question, equivalent to *quis tandem, who I pray,*) &c." [The rest of the note refers to a difference between them of no great consequence.]—Vol. ii. p. 438.

The objections to the authorized version are reasonable enough, but we must prefer De Wette's to Mr. Conybeare's, and think that the reference to 2 Cor. ii. 2, (*εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς, καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ εὐφραίνων με;*) is perfectly apposite. *Καί* is quite at home before *τί αἰρήσομαι*. Each passage furnishes an instance of its use at the beginning of the apodosis, involving a sense of the conjunction, immediately following from its obvious one of expressing addition. Conf. Rom. viii. 17, *εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρόνομοι*. *If children then (also) heirs*. So in the passages before us. "If I grieve you, who is he then (also) who gratifies me?" "If this is fruit, then the difficulty follows upon it, that what I shall choose I cannot decide." Conf. Hom., Il. a. 478.

Ἦμος δ' ἡριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως,
Καὶ τότ' ἔπειτ' ἀνάγοντο μετὰ στράτον εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν.

We therefore understand the place much as De Wette does—*"If I find in this the fruit of my labour, (if this, i.e., living in the flesh, brings me fruit of apostolic labour,) then which of the two I shall choose I do not decide, but am holden fast of both, my desire being to depart and to be with Christ, but my conviction that to live in the flesh is needful for your good."*

Neither can we agree with Mr. Conybeare in following the authorized version of Phil. ii. 5, (*οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*), in the words *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*. The line of argument absolutely requires that *ἄρπαγμόν* should be construed *a thing to be grasped at, a booty*, and the meaning of the passage is, that Christ did not think equality with God a thing to be grasped at, or eagerly caught, but that He gave it up for the good of man. Thus the whole passage is explained by our Lord's own words, John xvii. 5, *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was*. There is no force in the objection that this translation "makes *ἄρπαγμός*, the act of seizing, identical with *ἄρπαγμα*, the thing seized," as such irregularities are of frequent occurrence. Conf. *πίσις*, Rom. i. 25; viii. 19. So in classical Greek, Hom. Od. vi. 208, *δόσις ὀλῆγη τε φάλη τε*. So again,

λαχμός, a lot, χρησμός, an oracle. See Buttm. Larger Greek Grammar, E. T. § 119.

On the other hand, we cordially adopt Mr. Conybeare's version of the difficult passage, Col. ii. 23, πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός, literally, *in reference to the indulgence of the flesh*, and hence *to check it*. There is no difficulty in the πρὸς. As a jocose philologist of our acquaintance observed, "Poor πρὸς is morally indifferent, and flexible either to checking or promoting." In support of this usage numerous prepositional passages might be adduced. Tit. i. 1, ἀπόστολος κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ, *for furthering the faith of God's Elect*. Opening Wordsworth's Greek Grammar at random, we find ἐς χλαῖναν πόων δωρήσομαι, which he translates, *ad lænam (sc. faciendam.)* In fact, if Greek Grammarians had observed this important principle of language, boys would not groan under such long and cumbrous rules, as those which the prepositions now unintentionally heap upon them.

We also agree with the new and ingenious interpretation, or rather punctuation, of Phil. ii. 13, 14, which now stands in our Testaments thus:—τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε. Θεὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλει καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας. Πάντα ποιεῖτε χωρὶς ᾠγγυσμῶν. Mr. Conybeare would remove the stop from εὐδοκίας to ἐνεργεῖν, and translate "*work out your own salvation, &c., for it is God who works in you both will and deed. Do all things for the sake of good will, without murmurings and disputings.*" For the sense of εὐδοκίας he refers to i. 15, "*Some preach Christ . . . of good will,*" and to Luke ii. 14, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας. The sense of ὑπὲρ is not unlike that which it bears in Eur. Andr. 490, κτείνει δὲ τὴν τάλαιναν ἔριδος ὑπὲρ, and other places, both in Classical and Hellenistic Greek, where it implies a mental cause of action.

We have thus selected a few specimens of Mr. Conybeare's criticism, omitting purposely many passages, as those in the Epistle to the Romans, which would involve too long a discussion for this place. In so large a field it is not to be expected that his suggestions will meet with universal acceptance, and, indeed, he and his fellow-labourer would be the last to desire that their work should be considered final. We trust that they will see the subject continued, and yet further illustrated, by a goodly company of followers, who, like themselves, will bring to the consideration of it the spirit of energetic industry, sagacious criticism, and earnest faith. We already rejoice in some signs of this. In their own University is announced a *Journal of Clas-*

sical and Sacred Philology, supported by its most distinguished scholars, of which the *Prospectus* informs us that "by sacred philology is intended not merely the illustration of single passages of the Bible, but the methodical study of its several books and their history, including that of the versions and transcripts made in various periods;" and maintains that "the union of classical and sacred philology must prove equally beneficial to both." At Oxford are preparing editions of some of St. Paul's Epistles, by Mr. Stanley and Mr. Jowett, and it is rumoured that Mr. Scott, who has already done good service to the cause of classical lexicography, is engaged upon a lexicon of Hellenistic Greek. We earnestly hope that the labours of all these scholars may be crowned with the success which their high character warrants us in expecting. From Oxford have sprung the two most powerful theological movements of the last hundred years in England,—Methodism and Anglicanism. The spire of All-Saints, Wesley's church, is the monument of the first; that of St. Mary's, where Newman preached, of the second. May there now arise, within her time-hallowed precincts, a third school of divinity, which shall escape the errors of both, and bear witness to the truths from which each started; a school which shall avoid party names, and be founded on a criticism of Scripture at once intelligent and reverential, searching, earnest, and believing; uniting the research of Germany with the practical good sense and devout Christianity of England.

But Mr. Conybeare's labours are not exclusively exegetical. He is the author of all the later portion of the work; and we would especially commend to our readers' attention his *Essays* on two vexed questions, the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the persons to whom it is addressed that which is called the Epistle to the Ephesians. Whether they agree with his conclusions or not, they will see that it is possible for a man to differ from the ordinary view of the origin or purpose of a book of the Bible without losing his belief in the authority of the book itself, or weakening in any degree his Christian faith. We would also notice the important chapter (the 13th) on the heresies, &c., of the Apostolic age, in which he criticises an *Essay* on the subject by Mr. Stanley. We have no time left to break a lance with either combatant, but we may remark, that since the publication of this chapter Mr. Stanley has made alterations in his *Essay*,* and thereby acknowledged that there is force in some of Mr. Conybeare's objections. Let us close our sketch of this division of the work by extracting the account of St. Paul's

* "*Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age.*" Second Edition. P. 214.

martyrdom, as a striking specimen of Mr. Conybeare's historical style:—

“As the martyr and his executioners passed on, their way was crowded with a motley multitude of goers and comers between the metropolis and its harbour—merchants hastening to superintend the unloading of their cargoes—sailors eager to squander the profits of their last voyage in the dissipations of the capital—officials of the government, charged with the administration of the provinces, or the command of the legions on the Euphrates or the Rhine—Chaldean astrologers—Phrygian eunuchs—dancing-girls from Syria, with their painted turbans—mendicant priests from Egypt howling for Osiris—Greek adventurers, eager to coin their national cunning into Roman gold—representatives of the avarice and ambition, the fraud and lust, the superstition and intelligence, of the imperial world. Through the dust and tumult of that busy throng, the small troop of soldiers threaded their way silently, under the bright sky of an Italian midsummer. They were marching, though they knew it not, in a procession more truly triumphal than any they had ever followed, in the train of general or emperor, along the Sacred Way. Their prisoner, now at last and for ever delivered from his captivity, rejoiced to follow his Lord ‘without the gate.’ The place of execution was not far distant; and there the sword of the headsman ended his long course of sufferings, and released that heroic soul from that feeble body. Weeping friends took up his corpse, and carried it for burial to those subterranean labyrinths, where, through many ages of oppression, the persecuted Church found refuge for the living and sepulchres for the dead.

“Thus died the Apostle, the Prophet, and the Martyr; bequeathing to the Church, in her government and her discipline, the legacy of his Apostolic labours; leaving his Prophetic words to be her living oracles; pouring forth his blood to be the seed of a thousand Martyrdoms. Thenceforth, among the glorious company of the Apostles, among the goodly fellowship of the Prophets, among the noble army of Martyrs, his name has stood pre-eminent. And wheresoever the holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge God, there Paul of Tarsus is revered, as the great teacher of a universal redemption and a catholic religion—the herald of glad tidings to all mankind.”—Vol. ii. p. 503.

We will conclude this article by stating shortly some special reasons for prizing this contribution to our theological literature, with particular reference to the wants and evils of the age in which we live.

In the first place, in the present whirl of party controversy, it is most refreshing to turn to a book where Scripture is illustrated and studied for its own sake, and not with the view of making it the vehicle of the opinions of a sect. The two friends who are united in the authorship of this book, have shewn the possibility

and duty of taking the Bible as a guide, instead of turning it into a reflex of party language and party sentiments. We are quite sure, that if the Church is ever to rest from strife and division, and to acknowledge that beyond and above those different tendencies of different minds, which must always lead to some divergence of opinion, there is a common Christianity which is to bless and sanctify them all, it must be by our approaching the study of the sacred writings in the spirit of reverent piety, as learners and disciples, abandoning all sectarian watchwords, seeking to find the truth, not as it is assumed to be in high-churchism or lowchurchism, but as it was delivered by Christ's Spirit to His Apostles and Evangelists, and as they have recorded it for the instruction of mankind. Such a study of the Bible is most eminently promoted by the work before us, not only in its richness of illustration and clear explanations, but in its thorough freedom from party views, its pure and simple and earnest Christianity, its fairness and candour, its superiority to the miserable practice of distorting language to suit preconceived opinions.

Secondly, we cannot but hope that such a book as this may be useful to those who are perplexed in the tangled labyrinth of modern scepticism. Whatever uncertainty may hang over the origin of the three first Gospels, whatever cavils may have been suggested by unbelievers even against the Divine record of the beloved disciple himself, the very wildest speculation has not disputed the historical truth of St. Paul's life, and the authenticity of his principal Epistles. We cannot, in almost the last paragraph of a review, enter upon the argument for the truth of Christianity to be deduced from the life and writings of St. Paul. We would only just allude to the fact, that if we possessed the First Epistle to the Corinthians alone, which we believe that no German or English sceptic has ever yet impugned, we should have the fullest testimony not only to the reality of miracles, or at least of supernatural agencies, in the early Church, but to the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and to the institution of the Lord's Supper; and also we should see that within thirty years of the date assigned to these events, multitudes of men and women, both in Asia and Europe, had renounced their whole habits of life, and were prepared, if necessary, to separate from their nearest and dearest relations, that they might testify to their belief in them, and inherit the blessings which they involved. Any book which brings the life and character of St. Paul into clearer historical light and prominence, which helps us to recognise in him a real Man, swaying the destinies of the world by his energy of action, and preaching, and prayer, may well be hailed as a new support to

the intellectual evidences of our faith, at a time when many earnest and noble souls seem in danger of falling away.

Lastly, we welcome this book as written in a manner intelligible and attractive, not to scholars only, but to many other classes of various degrees of education. In these days of female colleges, when "young ladies of eighteen can generally conjugate the middle voice,"* we do not know whether our fairer readers will be offended if we tell them, that they may turn to these volumes with the hope of understanding St. Paul's life and Epistles, uninterrupted by any dissertations on Greek particles. In any case, we commend the book to that numerous class, increasing every day, whose early culture has necessarily been defective, but whose intelligence and thirst for knowledge is continually sharpened by the general diffusion of thought and education. Such persons, if they are already Christians by conviction, are naturally more and more dissatisfied with the popular commentaries on the Bible; and if they are sceptical and irreligious, this great evil is probably caused by the undeniable existence of difficulties which such commentaries shrink from fairly meeting. They will find in the work before us a valuable help towards understanding the New Testament. The Greek and Latin quotations are almost entirely confined to the notes: any unlearned reader may study the text with ease and profit. And it is from a sense of the great value of the book in this respect, that we would earnestly entreat the publishers to supply it in a cheaper and more convenient form. In these days a quarto book, except for reference, is a monster, *feræ naturæ*. Much as we admire the beautiful engravings, still more valuable as are the numerous and accurate maps, we would gladly see all the former, and half the latter, cut out of the volumes, in order that they might no longer be so far beyond the reach of ordinary readers as their price now makes them. When we see an intelligent Scotch or English manufacturer sitting by his fireside in an evening with a cheap octavo copy of Conybeare and Howson, and, we must add, unbewildered by references to Abd-el-Kader's voyages and the Rajah of the unpronounceable territory, we shall think that a step has really been taken to counteract the effect of translations from Strauss, and some at least of Mr. Chapman's quarterly series.

* Rev. Sydney Smith in the Edinburgh Review. We quote from memory.

- ART. III.—1. *The Ancient Music of Ireland, arranged for the Pianoforte, to which is prefixed a Dissertation on the Irish Harp and Harpers, including an Account of the Old Melodies of Ireland.* By EDWARD BUNTING. 4to. Dublin, 1840.
2. *A Collection of National English Airs, consisting of Ancient Song, Ballad, and Dance Tunes, interspersed with Remarks, and Anecdotes, and preceded by an Essay on English Minstrelsy.* Edited by W. CHAPPELL. 2 vols. 4to. London, 1838-40.
3. *Catalogue of the Library of the Sacred Harmonic Society.* London, 1853.

BETWEEN the intellectual and physical nature of man there exists, as it were, an intermediate state, partaking of both and yet not belonging to either of them. This is the wide region of feeling. In the midst—between mind and body—it forms the connecting link through which the action of one upon the other takes place. This region is the home of poetry. Like all feeling, poetry is a mystery, hidden behind that magic veil, which, more impenetrable than that of the statue of Isis, in the sanctuary of Sais, conceals from our mortal eyes the connexion of mind and body, so that single rays only can reach us from the enchanted land. We are enraptured by the ideal beauty of a Madonna Sixtina, and stand in mute enchantment at the glorious sight of an Alpine sunset, we shed tears of delight at the sound of Pergolesi's "Stabat," and feel transported by a line of Shakespeare, but what eloquent words have ever described these sensations? They are like the delicious dreams of a beautiful past, or like the single glances into a more glorious future, where all imperfections of our double being are forgotten, and both portions of our existence—mind and body—are satisfied.

In whatever position we consider man in general, one of his two natures, the physical and intellectual, is predominant over the other. In the toils and labours of our daily existence the first is so prevalent, nay, often so absorbing, that the latter, if it find any room for action, only serves as a tool; on the other hand, the tendency of our philosophical aspirations is to exclude, as much as possible, all earthliness, and to raise and isolate us, at least for single moments, from the bonds of our fragile human frame. Not so with poetry; its *essence is harmony*. It is the harmonious union of mind and body, a conciliation, so to say, of their opposing natures, wherein both are at rest. It is the only sphere granted to human kind wherein man can experience his twofold nature combined into one harmonious whole, and where

all the contrasts of his anomalous being are soothed. Humanity finds the expression of this harmonious union between mind and body in the fine arts. The most fugitive, but at the same time the most powerful phase of such expression is Music.

Our readers will perceive from these observations that we do not agree with the illustrious writer of the "Musical Dictionary," who, as is well known, defines music to be "the art of combining sounds in a manner agreeable to the ear," a definition which would, by analogy, justify every cook in calling herself an artist; nay, according to such a standard, even snuff-making would become an art, namely, that of mixing different sorts of drugs in a manner agreeable to the nose. Such a definition is too degrading, for it reduces music to a mere instrument of pleasure, and a means for the gratification of our senses only.

We are inclined to take a higher view, and would define music as "*the expression of IDEAS through the medium of sounds.*" Music is a kind of language, more eloquent than that of words, not confined to one race or one land, but speaking with equal force to every human breast from the civilized European to the African savage, and alike indigenous in the deserts of Sakhara and the virgin forests of America. It shares universality with the other arts, nay, in its adaptation to all the world, it is even superior to them, being more accessible to the great mass of mankind, and requiring less cultivation in order to be understood in its general features.

This superiority of music may be traced to two causes. First, it expresses only those general ideas which are more or less embodied in all men; and secondly, it expresses them more immediately than any other art, that is to say, the connexion between the idea and the sound is closer than that between any other art and its medium.

Of all our channels of communication with the outward world, the ear, more *alive* than any other sense, conveys impressions with the greatest rapidity to the mind. The first to awake and the last to sleep, its activity can hardly be said to cease when the other senses have gone to rest, and many a dream produced by external sounds proves the intimate communication maintained by this active watch and ward with external things. But it is not our purpose to enter into any inquiry as to the nature of sound. We intend to limit ourselves to those questions which are more intimately connected with the development of music in general, and which have special reference to the characteristics and the degree of perfection found in the national music of different countries.

In the history of the fine arts, as well as in the general history of mankind, individual nations and epochs are the representa-

tives of certain ideas; they embody and display them. Their life and being consist in the development and expression of these ideas; and we see them die away as soon as their office and destiny are accomplished, despite all artificial means to keep up a fictitious existence.

The mysterious and sublime genius of the East, the bright imagination of Greece, and the aspiring spirit of romantic Mediævalism, have expressed all the ideas expressible by architecture, sculpture, and painting, and have left us nothing more to say. This is the reason why we do not now build pyramids and Parthenons; sculpture Apollos of Belvidere and Venuses of Medicis, or paint Madonnas and Crucifixions. We have other ideas, and must endeavour to promulgate them through other media.

Music seems to be the art of our era. Its indefinite character leaves great freedom to the activity of the individual imagination. It is able to express our modern ideas in their comprehensiveness and generality. The most subjective of arts, it is the best suited to give a voice to that spirit of isolation and individuality which is the characteristic feature of our times. It is therefore the only art in which we not only equal, but far surpass all bygone ages.

Music, like all the other arts, is intimately allied in its development with the life of nations, and supplies one of the modes of expressing their individual existence; we can therefore trace in the music of a people the outlines of their peculiar character and history, and at the same time, in the development of the national music of different countries we perceive the general progress of this art.

Before alluding to some of those striking instances which indicate the unison in character between a nation and its music, it may not be undesirable to refer to its earliest development. Without entering into the practical traditions which trace its origin to the melodious whistling of the wind through the reeds of the Nile, and apart from any treasonable disparagement of the merits of the Sisters Nine or Sunny Apollo, we may say, that music, like its basis poetry, is coeval with humanity. Indeed, when we reflect how children connect the language of their amusements with measure and melody, and that no people have been discovered who have not some kind of music, however rude, we inevitably arrive at the deduction that music is innate in human nature. We likewise find in all the records of the human race traces of music from the earliest ages. The Sacred Scriptures, as well as the Egyptian monuments and the poems of Homer, preserve evidence not only of the existence but also of the great value in which this art was held by three of the

most remarkable peoples of antiquity,—the Jews, the Egyptians, and the Greeks; by all of whom it was intimately connected with their religious worship and the most solemn actions of their lives.

Without attempting to entangle our readers in the dark labyrinths of ancient record, we shall mention some circumstances which may throw some light on the general character of Ancient music. We read, for instance, in Josephus, that at the dedication of Solomon's temple, there were no fewer than 220,000 musical performers, most of whom handled instruments of percussion. If we connect this circumstance with the harshness of the guttural sounds in the Hebrew language, we must come to the conclusion that the Jews had a somewhat noisy taste in music. That Greek music was of a similar character we may guess from a passage of Lucian, who relates that a young flute-player named Harmonides, on his first appearance in the Olympic games, began a solo with so violent a blast, intending to surprise and electrify the audience, that he breathed his last breath into his flute and died on the spot. This anecdote, and the fact that trumpet-players at their festivals manifested an excess of joy when they found their exertions had neither rent their cheeks nor burst a blood-vessel, are proof enough of a clamorous style being at least one characteristic of the music of the Greeks.

From the beginning, music has ever been intimately connected with language, in fact, its earliest form consists in little more than the accentuation and rhythmus of the language itself. Rhythmus or measure, appears as necessary to nations in their infancy as to individuals. They require leading-strings for their thoughts, too feeble at first to move without such aid. It is with them as with children who learn verses more easily than prose, their memory having more hold on the sound and the rhythmus than on the meaning. We have an example of this in many eastern nations, especially in those of the Semitic and Tartar races, whose writings consist exclusively of rhymed prose or verses, which are not so much recited as sung or chanted after a certain rhythmus, and are also often accompanied by movements of the body. It is thus that the Mahometans read the Koran, and the Jews the Talmud. Who can describe whether the oratorical art of the ancients was not displayed in a manner somewhat analogous to this?

At all events, it seems certain that the most ancient music was simply poetry recited after a certain measure, the accompanying instruments marking the time rather than expressing any harmony. Such most probably was the way in which the Greek, Hebrew, and other ancient poets recited their verses, and the Celtic bards and northern Skalds impressed their wild rhapsodies on the memory of their countrymen. Motion in the body—the

rude beginnings of dance—was also generally if not always connected with poetry and music. Nor need we recur to history for proof. The American Indians, as well as the African savages, the nomadic as well as the settled races of Asia, retain to this day the primitive combination of poetry, music, and dance, or in other words, rhythmus in language, in sound, and in the motion of the body.

Such has music always been in its earliest stage—consisting of rhythm without harmony. The musical instruments congenial to this epoch, or rather characteristic of it, are those of percussion; and a people can scarcely be found who have not used one or two varieties of this class of instruments, indicating the analogy between the musical development of all races. But measure or rhythmus is not confined to time; it extends also to the first attempts at harmony. We may observe this in the frequent repetition of the same note, and in the anxiety manifested in the transitions from one sound to another, which in primitive music rarely takes a greater interval than a half, or at the utmost, one full note. A most curious proof of this, and an interesting fact in itself is, that all the nations in which these cautious infantine steps in music are most strikingly marked, possess not only half but also quarter notes. The latter are for the most part but slight tremblings of the chief note, and sound in our ears like an indistinct note, or often like a false one.

The music of the East, more especially that of the Semitic, Tartar, and Hindoo races, belongs to this primitive kind, and we easily detect in it the exclusive dominion of rhythmus over harmony. This is greatly aided by the character of the national instruments of the people,—the Indian gong and the Arab tambourine. In this music we also trace the feeble attempts at harmony, those cautious transitions of which we have spoken above as indicating the first infant steps of all races in music. In the music of the Arabs these early attempts are chiefly manifested in the frequent repetition of the same note;—in the Tartar and Turkish, by the constant use of half notes, and in the music of Hindostan by the almost invariable recurrence of shakes at the fall of the rhythmus.

The slight transitions which we have indicated, appear only like the rise and fall of the voice in the accentuation of words in speech, and give to the music of the East that wailing, out-drawn, apathetic monotony, which corresponds so accurately with their stationary nature and contemplative genius. As the transitions at the conclusion invariably descend, the commencement of every measure appears an effort, or rather a feeble attempt to rouse the dormant energies from that delicious half dreamy state in which the languid imagination of the Eastern races delights, but it is

soon followed by the fall of the *rhythmus*, re-establishing, as it were, the former repose. This general effect of the lethargic uniformity which is the characteristic feature of Eastern music, and which expresses so well their benumbed energy and undeveloped spirit, is much heightened by the use of the minor key, in which nearly all their melodies are written. The minor key seems a natural consequence of the frequent use of half notes, and occurs wherever these form the characteristic feature in music.

Eastern music is, however, more strikingly characterized by the peculiarity of its *rhythmus*, than by its system of harmony. Its anxious clinging to the nearest interval, to which we have alluded, is not so telling as the constant recurrence of the rhythmical fall. This imparts to Eastern music the sad monotony that makes it almost impossible for an inexperienced European ear to seize Eastern melodies, and which foils all attempts to fit them into Western musical forms. Indeed, the rhythmical fall recurs so constantly, that it prevents the formation of a distinct and definite air, (the consequence of the introduction of the *rhythmus* at certain regular intervals in the way of emphasis,) whereas the continual and uninterrupted use of the *rhythmus* destroys all accentuation, and brings forth a sameness which gives to Eastern melodies more the character of our recitatives than of musical airs.

The progress of music from this earliest phase, is manifested by its tendency gradually to emancipate itself from the fetters of *rhythmus*, and so to enlarge the freedom of its harmony. The first step in this direction is a diminished use of *rhythmus* causing the adoption of regular intervals, and the division of the music into defined and regular portions of time, giving to the composition the incipient form of an air. This is the stage of development to which the national music of most if not all the European communities has attained, and prior to it national music cannot be said to possess existence or a distinct character, for, in the previous stage, the same description of music is common to all nations. This sameness is produced by the absence rather than the similarity of characteristic features, and indicates the undeveloped state, in which the differences to be developed in the future, are at first neutralized as in a common medium.

Such a course of progression in music harmonizes with the development of national life. Nationality—the conscious feeling of unity in a people of the same race, language, habits and customs, and history—is to the community what the feeling of personality is to the individual,—the assertion of a distinct being in opposition to all others. It requires a certain amount of united action, and of simultaneous development, before a nation becomes conscious of this feeling, and the feeling must have acquired con-

siderable strength before a nation is able to express it in its literature and arts. Now the Eastern races have no conscious national life, but live only in a sort of co-existence where habit and custom rule, never attaining to a mental perception of their union as a nation. Hence the undeveloped and characterless state of their music, for the stronger the national feeling, the more distinctly marked and characteristic will be the music of the people.

The distinctive character of national music is chiefly found in its rhythmus, that is to say, the measure of the sounds. It is partly by the introduction of different rhythmus, and partly by the application of the same rhythmus at different intervals, that the varieties of national music are produced.

Rhythm in the national music of a people is based on its language. Vocal music if not altogether prior to instrumental, has been at all events most prominent in the early stages of music, and it still forms a distinguishing portion of all national music, marked by the circumstance that no national air exists without a corresponding song. Recollecting this, and also that all vocal music, in order to be expressive, must be accommodated to the language in which it is sung, it is perfectly natural that the prosody of a national tongue should invariably regulate the character of its musical rhythmus. The rhythmus in the music of a people cannot, therefore, be understood out of connexion with its language; moreover, a reciprocal action will be found to exist between language and music, those two most powerful agents for the expression of the life of a people, and which, if investigated with care, would probably afford us many a glimpse into the innermost being of nations, and aid us in tracing out more accurately, not only their national development, but also the effects of their contact with foreign elements, as well as the new phases originated by such contact, and the changes brought about by the mixture of different national elements upon the same ground.

We have the best and simplest illustrations of the influence of language upon rhythmus in the national music of the pure races.

The most striking example in this respect is the music of the Slave races. In the Slave languages in general, but more especially those of the South-eastern Slave races,—the Russians, Servians, Croatians, Bulgarians, &c.,—no emphasis is laid on the words, and no prosody exists. They present to the ear a smooth and monotonous flow of sounds, unbroken by any modulation, and with their copious sibilating and hissing sounds, produce an impression analogous to the undefined and mysterious rustling of the breeze through the leaves of a forest. It is this want of emphasis which accounts for the great diffi-

culty foreigners have in acquiring the Slave languages, and which, on the other hand, imparts to the Slave races themselves that admirable facility for speaking foreign languages with the utmost purity, a talent for which they are deservedly renowned. Having no native accent in their own language, they can the more easily seize and imitate that of other languages. The general character of the Slave, especially the South-Slave music, which is the purest, corresponds with this peculiarity in the language of the race. We find the same smooth and melodious flow, produced by a continuous use of notes of the same value, which is so prevalent in the old airs, principally in the Russian and Cossack. Not a single note of a different value is introduced, but the whole air consists of notes of the same kind,—for instance, of quavers or semiquavers.

This negative characteristic in language and music, harmonizes with the entire character and history of the people. In the former it manifests itself by the astonishing power of assimilation and pliability which is common to all branches of this race, and of which we have a striking example in the Mohametan Slaves of the Ottoman Empire, who are “plus Turques que les Turques;” in the latter by the absence of a *conscious* national union. With the exception of the Poles no portion of the Slave race possessed that unity; even in the ears of the millions of the mighty Czar, the name of Slave has still a very indistinct meaning. The Slave races have only just awakened from their lethargic sleep; they *have* mustered the formidable strength of their millions, and have now come to claim their place in the history of nations.—The Poles once held this position; they *were* a nation, and their music as well as their history tells their tale. The heart-stirring strains of their mazurkas fail not now to make many a bosom beat and ache, as they remind the listeners of past times. Poland may be politically dead, but it is immortalized in the playfully sad and entrancing accents of its music, which, like the spirit of the departed, hovers around us, and on the wings of magic sound float before our mental eye, in the airy forms of that light-minded and brave-hearted people, who, like the generous spendthrift, lived in a gay turmoil, and drained with eager lips and reckless spirit the cup of joy until the summons of parting came.

The mechanical part of the Polish mazurkas, especially their changing and fugitive rhythmus, which at one time lays the emphasis on the first, at another time on the second note of the bar, —also the short note immediately preceding,—and, finally, the lively uneven time which they invariably keep, are admirably suited to embody the light and graceful spirit of this people.

But we must now leave the Polish and Slave music in gene-

ral, as our attention is already arrested by their next neighbours, whose fate was, and still is, intimately interwoven with theirs, and who form the most striking contrast with the Slave races. We refer to the Hungarians.

Living on the confines of the East and the West, this people belongs to the former by descent, and to the latter by civilisation. Geographical position has decided their destiny. In the midst, between two contrasting elements, they have been exposed to the attacks of both, and their history records little but one continual struggle for existence as a nation; at one time threatened by the brutal aggressions of the warlike races of the East, at another time endangered by the cunning, but more fatal intrusions of the German emperors. This continual warfare, instead of effacing the feeling of nationality in the Hungarian, only tended to render it all absorbing, and to concentrate in that one feeling,—the love of country and race, the whole energy of an enthusiastic people. Nationality thus became uppermost in the life of the Hungarian, and it is now the influence ruling all his ideas, his feelings, his poetry, and his pursuits in arts and science.

We find it also embodied in his music, breathing tales of war and sorrow. A thousand years of residence in Europe have not made the Hungarian forget the shrill war-cry of his ancestors, at whose sounds Byzany has often trembled. It still lives in the wild accents of his music, whose every sound recalls to his mind a world of recollections, and speaks of victories and glories, but also of cruel sufferings and heartless injustice. Every note of its wild melancholy strain is a memento to him, and while it makes him sad, inspires him with hope and enthusiasm, leading him with an equally irresistible charm to the dance or to the battle field.

The Hungarian music possesses a more strongly pronounced, and, perhaps, a more regularly applied rhythmus, than any other music, so that foreigners having once heard it, cannot easily mistake its sounds for those of any other national music. The key to this lies in the language.

The Hungarian language, like all Eastern tongues with monosyllabic roots, composes its derived words by adding to the root one or more formative particles, and combining them with the root into one word. As the accent in Hungarian falls on the root, which, with very few exceptions, always stands at the beginning of the word, all polysyllabic words in Hungarian necessarily become either Trochees or Dactyles. This peculiarity in the prosody imparts to the Hungarian language that measured pathos and earnestness which so admirably adapted it for epic poems and their hexameters. The Hungarian is the language of a people of warriors. It sounds like a march,—solemn,

deep, rhythmical and impassionate, while the great number of onomatopœic words give to it such a power of expression, that the sound of the language often seems identical with the meaning of the words. Therefore few countries exist where the oratorical art exerts such immense influence over the minds of the people, and where this art is, or at least was until lately, so widely spread.

In the prosody of the Hungarian language we likewise find the key to the rhythmus of the Hungarian melodies, which may be represented by the Choriambus of the ancients | - ∪ ∪ - | while it seems more than probable that this rhythmus has led to the use of the even time in which all Hungarian airs are written.

From the borders of the East we wander to the western outskirts of our continent, among the remains of that mighty race which was once spread over the greater half of Europe, and whose disorganized fragments are now fast forsaking the solitary corner which they have hitherto retained, the last territorial legacy of their ancestors. The last representatives of the Celtic race are hastening to bid farewell to the hemisphere which harboured them so long, and are seeking a new home and brighter destinies across the Atlantic. The part which they had to play as an individual race on the old continent has ceased, and the elements of their national existence are to be mixed up with those of other races on another soil, in order to become a constituent particle in the formation of a new and herculean people.

But national elements are as imperishable in the economy of nature as physical atoms; they only change their form. The Celtic race has not vanished from its old haunts without leaving indelible traces of its existence, dispersed from the snowy Alps or the mighty Danube, to the Pillars of Hercules and to Erin's Green Isle. There is many a feature in the external appearance and character of the western European nations, and many a word in their languages, and many an old custom and superstition which still remind the historian and antiquarian of the people of the Druids and Bards.

Not the least important of these monuments of the Celtic race is their music. What an interesting fact, that a race which has run its course in its old home should leave behind it, in its music, a language of grief so affecting, that other people, although strangers to its fate, listen with deep emotion to the heart-rending sounds that this fallen race sends forth like a dying swan. It is even more extraordinary, that from among these tones of grief the ear is sometimes pierced by a cry of merriment, sounding like mockery amidst the usual strain of sorrow; it is like the sun breaking through the rain clouds. Such is the music which we inherit from the Celtic race.

Their thoughtless and warm-hearted gaiety, like an inseparable

nature, has not been changed by the iron weight of adversity, which has not been able to do more than impart to the merry strain of their tunes, that longing which constitutes their chief charm and most prominent characteristic. It is indeed so prominent that the melodies of this race sound to our ear like the songs of memory. Their fond memory of bygone happier days is characteristically expressed with more or less force in the music of all Celtic races. Both rhythmus and harmony combine to effect this. The first by the long drawn wailing Trochee | - ~ | which drags itself through all Celtic melodies, and the latter by the equally characteristic sixth major. These are common to the music of all Celtic nations, and notwithstanding the varied development which the science may have taken in the different branches of this race, these two characteristic marks sufficiently indicate the common origin and kindred nature of the Celtic melodies wherever found. Music seems in truth to be interwoven with the whole existence of the Celtic people. It civilized and humanized the race, accompanied it to power, and now mourns over its grave. An emanation of the theocratic institutions, it formed one powerful link in the chain which held together the whole Druidic system. The Bards were from the first most important agents in supporting the sacerdotal and in counteracting the chieftain power, and it was with a jealous eye that the priestly caste watched over the education of these powerful movers of minds and hearts in order to concentrate all light and might in their own body, and to prevent the stray wandering of a single ray that might illuminate with another brilliancy than their own, the gloomy hemisphere of their reign. In vain their watchfulness;—the light came from another side. The Druids fell, but not the Bards, who became more deeply rooted in the hearts of their countrymen, and even after the introduction of Christianity, maintained throughout the Celtic portion of the British Isles their exceptional position, continuing to oppose the power of the chieftains, as we see from the unceasing efforts of the latter to break their galling influence. Amidst all this internal strife, and the long bloody wars with the Anglo-Saxon race, the Celtic music—which, like the whole Druidic institutions, according to *Cæsar*, had its chief seat in our island, to whose schools all neophytes resorted—attained the highest degree of perfection. At an age when the soft lays of the troubadours were not yet heard amid the wild turmoil of turbulent and contending nations, before their very language had been moulded, the British and Irish bards poured forth their heart-stirring war-songs and rhapsodies.

The purest of the Celtic musical compositions which are preserved to us, are those of the Irish bards, and in their melodies

we hear most distinctly that mingling of half laughing and half sobbing sounds which seem to be the voice of the race, while the Scotch tunes laugh more merrily and the Welsh sob more mournfully. The emphatic sixth major is the leading feature of the Irish music. It is there in its original purity, and so strikingly introduced, that it does not need an acute ear to distinguish at once by its guidance an Irish melody from every other.

In the Scotch music we must particularize two very different kinds,—the real Highland tunes, and what we should call the Scoto-Irish melodies on account of their close resemblance to the Irish airs, which is often so great that many of them are claimed by both nations. There was frequent intercourse between the Irish and Scotch bards, in which the former, as the most cultivated, obtained the upper hand, and modified the original character of Scotch music. In the Highlands only, where their influence never penetrated, it remained pure. Notwithstanding this amount of Irish influence, we can easily distinguish Scotch from Irish tunes; a peculiarity in the rhythmus marks the difference. Thus in the most pathetic of Scotch tunes the playful change and inversion of the original Celtic rhythmus, an essential and exclusive Scotch conventionality, is occasionally introduced. This is never to be found in Irish airs, as they preserve the pure Celtic Trochee throughout, without the slightest alteration.

The most striking examples of this playful Scotch rhythmus occurs in the unquestionably Highland pibrochs and strathspeys, and these are the real representatives of genuine Scotch music, which may be said to ring with wild laughter, admirably embodying the merry-heartedness of the Celtic character. The alterations and inversions in the rhythmus go so far as to produce a new rhythmus, a union of the Antispastus of the ancients $| : \cup - - \cup :$ alternately with the Choriambus $| : - \cup \cup - :$. This rhythmus is enhanced by the abrupt close of most Highland tunes with the fifth, deluding, as it were, even at the last moment, the ear, which is waiting for the key-note as a rest from that shrewd playfulness that has harassed it through the whole tune. These tunes, full of exuberant joyous spirit and wild enthusiasm, would almost look like a satire, when charged upon our sober, cautious, and calculating northerners, were we not often reminded by many a half humorous, half self-constrained look, that the spark of Celtic wit still lurks beneath the serious and shrewd faces of the Scotch people.

In Scotch music we observe, perhaps more conspicuously than in any other music, the influence of the musical instrument on the music itself.

Musical instruments are to music what tools are to a handicraft

employment. They are invented and perfected according to the development of music; but as the tools influence the handicraft, so musical instruments in their turn react on the character of music, and impart to it a distinctive character, leading even to considerable modifications in its general features, and thus form an important agency in the whole development of the art. We have only to remind our readers of the connexion between the grand Erard pianos of seven octaves and the new pianoforte schools. We need scarcely ask, could the one exist without the other? We can thus trace the action of musical instruments in the national music of all countries, and in most instances we can discern in the character of the music, the nature of the instrument which serves to express it. In every Spanish air we hear the sighing of the mandolin or the clinking of the castanet, in the Venetian we have the dreamy sound of the guitar, in the Swiss the echo of the bugle,—and who could mistake in Scotch music the drone of that old worthy the bagpipe? It seems growling at the follies of the small reeds, while it accompanies their mad leaps with its uniform and benignant hum, and largely contributes to the humorous effect by the contrast it presents to the quick high notes of Scotch tunes. To the bagpipe we must attribute in a great measure the predominancy in the Scotch music of fifths and thirds, besides the emphatic sixth major.

The third and last pure branch of Celtic music is the Welsh. Although of a kindred if not the same origin as the Irish and Scotch, its connexion with them must have been early severed, for it has assumed a distinct character. We learn from Hammer's Chronicle, (p. 197,) that in the latter end of the eleventh century, Griffith ap Conaw, Prince of Wales, who had resided a long time in Ireland, brought over with him into Wales "divers cunning musicians, who devised in manner all the instrumental music upon the harp and crowth that is there used, and made laws of minstrelsy to retain the musicians in due order." Notwithstanding this importation the diversity between the Welsh and the other branches of the Celtic music remained.

It is true many Welsh tunes possess to a certain degree the two characteristic marks of the pure Celtic music, the emphatic sixth major and the trochee in their rhythmus, but these particularities do not form the distinctive features. Another peculiarity essentially Celtic is also retained, and much more prominently than in the Irish and Scotch music, although they preserve it to a certain degree, namely, the frequent and successive repetition of the same note, and this principally at the fall of the rhythmus. This is a characteristic which Welsh music has in common with many French airs. Without entering into disputes about the origin of old Britons and their connexion with the Gauls, we

may point out this singular fact as indicating national music to be one of the keys which will help to open those long hidden but not lost records of bygone races, that lie buried as secretly if not as deeply as those fossil remains from which the genius of Cuvier and Owen have re-constructed an extinct world of animal life. In Welsh music we perceive the character of that hard struggle which the old Britons sustained for centuries, first against the Romans, and then against the Anglo-Saxon race; and we have only to listen to one of their many spirited and warlike tunes, to understand the policy, or as some may call it, cruelty, of Edward I. after the conquest of Wales, when he raged more against the Welsh bards than against the Welsh chieftains. He very well knew that those inspired martial sounds were more calculated to stir up the energy of a patriotic people than all the prosaic commands of a chieftain. This military spirit has imbued Welsh music with its energetic character, and speaks, louder than a thousand tongues, of those brave deeds and that burning patriotism which awed even Cæsar's invincible legions, and which only fell after a stern death-struggle, before the expansive force of a more powerful race.

As Welsh nationality yielded to the superior spirit of the conquering race, so too did Welsh music,—and although, as we have observed, the prominent Celtic character is distinctly visible, many of their tunes now exhibit strong touches of a foreign hand and mind; this influence is chiefly observable in the occurrence of the seventh at the concluding cadence, one of the prominent features of Teutonic music, and which is never found in pure Irish or Scotch airs.

Another and very extensive family of national music, which, with less or more of purity, has spread over the whole western half of Europe, is the Teutonic.

The invasion of the Germanic tribes in the beginning of our era originated new nations and languages, and the new languages led to a new music. The northern warriors, like the Celtic chieftains, had their bards, who, first in the battle-field themselves, immortalized their gallant countrymen in songs of praise, but where can now the faintest sound of *their* voice be traced? It was so mingled with the first cries of the new-born infant nations of the west, that we can nowhere distinguish the most distant echo of their warlike appeals. The invaders imported from their northern forests a grand and new idea,—the idea of individuality. The classic world acknowledged only Greeks and Romans, but no individual men. Christianity first taught and established the worth of *man as man*, making the slave equal to the king in the eye of God. This great truth failed to become a reality in the corrupted and prejudiced Roman world, and the

strong individuality of the Teutonic warriors was requisite to receive the graft of this ennobling principle; that it might bring forth fruit and be propagated through the world by a vigorous stock. The idea of individuality thus became the keystone of Christian civilisation, and all the institutions, languages, sciences and arts of modern European nations, have grown up and flourished upon this principle. *

Its effect is also observable in the music of these nations, according as they were more or less influenced by the new element. It imparted to their national airs some common features which, though strangely mixed up and variously developed, nevertheless connect the music of all by one common chord of relationship. To this fraternity belong not only the pure Teutonic nations, as the Scandinavians and Upper and Lower Germans, but also those nations which trace their origin to the mixture of the Teutonic with the Roman and the Celtic races, namely, the English, French, Italian, and likewise the Portuguese and Spanish.

The most distinctive features in the national music of the Teutonic family are, what we may call the Iambic rhythmus, because its prominent feature is the Iambus $|\text{ } \cup \text{ } - \text{ } |$, and the full tonic accord at the concluding cadence; the first giving to this music a bold energy indicating the enterprising spirit of the Teutonic race, while the second imparts to it a fulness of expression and harmony, corresponding with the comprehensive and idealistic nature of the people, making their music adequate to their highest aspirations.

The origin of this music dates from the formation of the new languages and the introduction of rhymed verse, that is to say, about the tenth and eleventh centuries.

The bold individual character of the northern warriors, with its consequence, a noble feeling of honour, combined with their admiration and esteem for the fair sex, and their religious zeal, created that sublimest of all mediæval institutions—chivalry, which, like a sacred talisman, guarded the world from debasement in the mighty convulsions which followed the great emigrations, and during the lawless state of feudalism. Chivalry found its interpreter in minstrelsy. Both became the common property of all western Christian nations, and established a kind of solidarity among them, which counterbalanced in some measure the strong tendency of the Teutonic races to isolation. In the specimens of early minstrelsy we can trace, as in a common source, the national music of all nations belonging to, or influenced by, the Teutonic element.

The old Gallia Narbonensis, that romantic land of the laurel and the vine, which, washed on one side by the placid waves of the Mediterranean, forms almost a triangle on the lines where

the three branches of the so-called Romanic races, the French, Italian, and Spanish meet, soon captivated and tamed the northern barbarians who had invaded and subdued it, so that while the war of races continued to rage, in other parts of Europe, the mild sun of Provence had already quickened the exotic seed, which, mingling with the fruitful elements of the adopted soil, brought forth luxuriant flowers—the sweet lays of the Troubadour—as harbingers announcing to the world a new spring of civilisation. The Provençal Troubadours and their songs soon spread over the west of Europe, in the same way as, five centuries later, the French language, French manners, and French sciences and arts became the lawgivers of European society. But their reign lasted scarcely more than a century. The new nations soon began to develop themselves and their languages; each followed its respective tendency, and created its own national music.

The French continued the disciples and successors of the Troubadours, and so faithfully, that many of the earliest Troubadour songs would serve at the present day, with very little alteration, as *airs de Vaudeville*, while any of the latter, written on smoky parchment, would equally well represent the tender effusions of the enamoured Troubadours. French airs, like Troubadour songs, are a mixture of boldness, almost temerity, with tenderness and gallantry,—behind which the merry Celtic nature lurks, communicating to their most tender strains an air of delicate mockery and refined elegance, in conformity with French nature and taste. This effect is considerably heightened by the light and graceful rhythmus of the French songs, in which, as in those of the Provençal Troubadours, the Iambus has been transformed into the Anapæstus | . . . - : |.

More remotely allied to the Troubadour songs, stand the national airs of the other Romanic nations,—the Italians, Portuguese, and Spaniards. It would seem as if mountains formed the natural boundaries of nations, which even the airy sounds of music cannot overpass. Thus the Alps and Pyrenees only re-echoed the voice of the Troubadours, obstructing its entry into the heart of the people beyond them. From the earliest period in history, the Italian and Spanish Peninsulas have been the abode of a number of small fragments of different races, which Roman power and civilisation united under one rule. When this power fell, the assimilated but not amalgamated particles, split again and pursued their former separate courses, as can be still traced in the numerous provincial differences existing in both Peninsulas, which have hitherto defied all attempts to create a strong national union.

There is, however, one feature in which they all participate,

and that is the Southern blood and nature. The infusion of the German element produced no lasting effect, it soon yielded beneath a soft and enervating sky, and adapting itself to the new soil, lost its vital energy without imparting much of its tone or temper to the national character, the language, or music of the Southern races. We therefore see little evidence of the effects of the energetic Teutonic rhythmus remaining in Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish airs. Too strong and too harsh for the indolent and delicate ear of a Southern people, the Teutonic rhythmus has been neutralized—principally by the introduction of triplets in the air as well as in the accompaniment. Thus a sort of soft and lulling melody and measure has been created more in harmony with the delightful indolence and fanciful repose to which those lands of the sun, of poetry, and luxuriant nature irresistibly invite.

As if to counteract by some stimulus the effect on the ear of so enervating a strain, this music inserts before the fall of the rhythmus, a note,—either the next lowest semitone, or the next highest full tone,—or in some cases repeats the note on which the rhythmus falls. Thus the want of energy in the rhythmus appears to be seeking a compensation in the greater acuteness of harmony. This is a characteristic common to the music of all the nations south of the Alps and the Pyrenees, but it is chiefly conspicuous in the Portuguese and Italian, with the exception of the Venetian.

Venice, the poetical city of the Lagunes, half oriental in its history, commercial greatness, customs, and architecture, has the same Eastern influence floating on its strains of music. This is the secret of the charm which Venice possesses for our imagination. We feel the two contrasting elements, East and West, blending in a harmonious and beautiful union. Spain affords us a similar instance. Vain were all the purifying Auto-da-fés of the Holy Inquisition; vain the copious blood-shedding of the zealous Hermandad. The Moorish blood has not yet been eradicated from the Spanish nature, it still imparts a darker hue to the purest blue-blooded Hidalgo, a sunnier glow to the Andalusian beauty, and a softer monotone to her songs and the liquid tinkle of her guitar.

Both the Venetian and Spanish music show traces of Arab influence, but in the first it is only like a dim dream of past events, which manifests itself by the frequent repetition of single notes as well as of whole melodies—an essential feature in Arab music. Whereas, Spanish airs are often so Moorish in rhythmus, harmony, and accompaniment, that we can hear in them tones almost like the melancholy call of the Muezzin, or the monotonous recital of the Koran. Spanish swords have indeed conquered

the Moors, but Moorish blood and genius still reign over the Spaniards.

The music of all Romanic nations, like their languages, exhibits the influence of the various elements that have been at work in its production, and it would require a separate article to trace and sift the action of these influences, in the different branches of the Romanic race, and in their minor provincial subdivisions. We have therefore restricted ourselves to the delineation of some of those generic features, which give the predominant character to the music of this class of nations, and we hasten to speak of those people in whose national music the full tonic accord, and the Iambus in the rhythmus,—the two great characteristics of Western, or, as we called it, Teutonic Music, not only exist as main features, but where they are found pure and unbiassed by any foreign element. We refer to the music of the English and German people.

It has been often observed as one of the remarkable phenomena in the life of modern nations, that the Anglo-Saxon race has attained to the most prominent position among the people of the earth, and that, like the Greeks of old, it is carrying its civilisation to the remotest parts of the world, whereas the ancient stock whence it sprung still vegetates rather than lives in its old home, shewing no signs of a similar energy. Without forgetting the influence of various other circumstances, among which climate and geographical position are not the least, we would suggest as a chief cause, that mixture of different national elements, which, in fact, constitutes the Anglo-Saxon character. It seems to be a natural law, that a race of men as well as animals after a time degenerates, and therefore requires renewal by the infusion of foreign blood. The most striking result of the mixtures, represented by the modern Anglo-Saxon race, is, that the old Teutonic element has absorbed and incorporated the others, without losing anything of its primeval vitality. Nay, on the contrary, the contact and struggle with them has only developed in a higher degree and much more prominently its original nature. Thus, in the national character of the English, we see that energy and love of freedom of the old Teutonic tribes preserved in its greatest purity; in the English language, we find the most primitive Northern simplicity of construction; and in the English airs we hear the strongest accentuation of the Teutonic rhythmus. They contain few if any traces of the influence of foreign taste, to which they have been incessantly exposed, and neither the wailing, grief, and boisterous merriment of the Celts, nor the monotonous tenderness of the Troubadours, have adulterated their character. The true English tunes—of which “The Jolly Miller” and “Old King Cole,” are among

the most striking examples—are full of a daring, independent, and buoyant spirit, presenting the living expression of that hardy Anglo-Saxon race, which shuns no difficulty and cares for no danger, while the minor key in which the airs are invariably written, forms with the boldness of the rhythmus a contrast so humorous, that the truth of the epithet, “Merry Old England,” strikes at once in all its force.

The greatest part of these tunes date from the reign of the Tudors, when, after the bloody wars which had distracted the country, the nation found itself again united, and put forth all its energy in the feeling of nationality, which Henry VIII. and Elizabeth knew how to guide and satisfy, by assigning to England a prominent rank among the powers of Europe, thus directing the attention of the people from their own encroachments at home. The puritanic psalmodes put an end for a while to these humorous strains, but with the Restoration the latter revived, and, provided with suitable words, formed a weapon not at all despicable, when wielded, as they were, with equal skill by Cavaliers and Whigs, during the skirmishes of the two parties which ended in the Revolution of 1688. They are now again lost among the humming of the cotton-spindles, the whirr of the woollen-shuttles, and the noisy monster concerts of Monsieur Jullien. A fiddler here and there alone dares to resist the modernizing current, and to play some of these animating and hearty strains at a country fair, where the songs of their forefathers are drunk in with untiring delight by the Saxon herdsman and mechanic.

The cosmopolite nature of the Germans speaks out loudly in the character of their music. In it rhythmus, the most important and distinguishing feature in national music, loses its pre-eminence, and becomes altogether secondary. Only in the “Iodlers” and “Ländler” of the Tyrolese, Austrian, and Swiss mountaineers, is the original Teutonic iambic still maintained in its utmost purity, and by its simplicity and regularity continues to impart to these melodies a lovely pastoral expression, in unison with the primitive condition and peaceful existence of these people. In all other German music the rhythmus has been so subordinated to harmony that every kind of rhythmus is met with, no kind being prominent. German music, therefore, cannot now be termed national; as such it has ceased to exist, for it is no longer the expression of the life of an individual people; it lost its distinctive character when it expanded itself to embrace the ideas and aspirations of the surrounding nations. But this must not be regarded as a retrograde step,—rather as one of progress; for, as we have said, the development of music advances as it emancipates itself from rhythmus, thereby increas-

ing the freedom and force of its harmony. It is only when the national rhythmus is sacrificed to harmony that music can acquire that comprehensive freedom necessary to express the whole range of human feeling, and not the particular character and emotions of one nation only.

German and Italian music have attained this degree of development. The first, an emanation of the idealistic and transcendental North, soars eagle-like loftily to the skies, following the highest aspirations of the human breast; the second, a child of the sunny South, speaks the glowing language of passion, and re-echoes, with harmonious voice, all those fervid emotions which form alike the delight and misery of our existence. While other nations follow their appointed course by influencing the material welfare and the social institutions of the modern world, the Germans and Italians have revived and fructified by their genius the scientific and artistic sphere, and have immortalized by numberless productions of the mind the civilisation of the age. This power of expressing the ideas and tendencies of a whole epoch in monuments of art and philosophy is their compensation for what they have lost of their national life.

National music is, then, a touchstone by which we can test the national life of a people or race. If undeveloped, we may hear in it the first inarticulate sounds of awakening consciousness, and trace in the monotony of its strains the depressing fetters of habit, which still constitute the supreme law of the nation; and whatever be the stage the community has attained to in material progress, it cannot in such circumstances be said to possess nationality, for *consciousness* of unity will be absent. On the other hand, national airs, with a strongly marked and regularly introduced rhythmus, are the sign of fully developed national energy. They embody the special character and express the genuine tendencies of the nation to which they belong. They bear the marks of all its changes for weal and wo. They are the faithful interpreters of the destiny of a nation from its birth to its grave. They continue to resound even after its death, and are the apotheosis of a departed race.

- ART. IV.—1. *Nouveau Manuel des Aspirants au Baccalauriat des Lettres. Par Emile Lefranc. Vingt-Sixième édition. Année Scolaire, 1852-1853.*
2. *Programme des Cours de la Faculté de Droit de Paris 7ième Novembre 1853.*
3. *Kalendarium Archigymnasii Pontificii Bononiensis. Anno Scholastico. 1852-1853.*
4. *Prospetto degli Studi dell' Imperiale Regia Università di Padova per Anno Scolastico. 1851-1852.*
5. *Lunario Pisano. 1853.*
6. *Circular of the Graduates' Committee of the University of London. 6th September 1853.*

POLITICAL power may be claimed for a learned class as such, apart from and in addition to that which, on the ground of wealth or otherwise, would accrue to it through its individual members, either by that class on its own behalf, or by the community in name of the common interest. From whichever side the claim or the proposal may come, the ground on which it rests will be the same, namely, the peculiar social position and functions of the class in whose favour it is put forth. If it emanates from the learned themselves, or the Universities as their representatives, it will be to this effect. Citizen duties being, in every case, not the ground only, but the measure, of citizen rights, it follows that the latter emerge to the class, and to the individual in direct proportion to the extent to which the former are discharged. But it cannot be doubted that, in the existing state of society, these duties are discharged most efficiently by those who have cultivated their mental gifts with the greatest assiduity, and have developed their spiritual nature farthest, and it is consequently clear, that if there is a class who, in this respect, surpass the rest of the community, their claim to political privileges will be greater than that of their fellow-citizens.

Or the argument may be founded, not on political right, but on political expediency. It will be admitted that, in a free state, political expression cannot, with prudence, be denied to any actually existing and operative social power, and further, that in the learned class such power does exist to a far greater extent than is indicated by their wealth. We have here a social force, of which a suffrage based on wealth can take no cognizance, and a consequent claim for direct representation.

The same line of argument, in both its branches, possesses equal force, and comes with a still better grace when urged by the rest of the community, and that not on behalf of the learned, but of themselves. In this case the views of direct political

justice and general expediency, will be strengthened by considerations directly arising from the common interest. Where an enlightened despotism exists, it is possible that the community may, without prejudice to its interests, dispense for a time with the aid of the general intelligence. One man of great ability may, and we know in a few instances has, charged himself with the whole public relations of his fellow-citizens, and has not only preserved internal tranquillity to the state, but has prosperously and gloriously vindicated its external position, with no other counsellors than those whom he himself has selected. In such circumstances the work of social and individual development may be tranquilly and securely prosecuted in the walks of private life, whilst all that is lost to private energy and manhood, is the great training school of public affairs. But in free, *i.e.*, self-governing states, such can never be the case. There, the character of private as well as public events, the whole tendency of the nation's history, is determined by the general spirit of the time, and it is the manifest interest of every individual whom that spirit governs, that political expression should be given to whatever elements of truth and soberness it contains. To exclude these is voluntarily to prefer an irrational to a rational control.

Whether it be urged in its own name, then, or in the name of the community, it would seem that the claim of a learned class to political representation is incontrovertible. But the conditions of the argument, in both cases, will suppose that this class is efficiently discharging its own very peculiar and special duties. It must be more than a professional class, carrying on a certain portion of the business of the community, and remunerated by the community to the full extent of its services in money, for there the claim would either be altogether satisfied by the timocratic suffrage, or would merge in a much wider claim on behalf of the whole professional classes, which is not now under discussion. It must be something different from even the teaching staff of the professions, for in this body, as such, the public have no guarantee for anything beyond an acquaintance with the manner in which skilled labour may be dexterously performed. Nor is this view founded on the consideration that professional teachers frequently exercise the profession which they teach. There is no incongruity in an individual, or a class of individuals, being represented in two capacities entirely distinct, provided that the fact corresponds with the political interpretation, and that they do positively possess two separate spheres of activity and influence. A professional man may, and very often will, be a member of the learned class, and on this ground entitled to separate representation.

just as he may, as a landed man, be entitled to vote in a county though he lives in a town. What we say, however, is, that as a teacher of his profession purely, he has no such separate sphere of activity and influence, and consequently can be entitled to no separate political status. The case will be different, no doubt, if the subject of his teaching be a *science*, even though that science should bear so directly on a profession as to be vulgarly regarded as one of its branches. Physiology and anatomy are intimately connected with medicine and surgery, but apart from these professions they have a universal scientific character, which entitles their professors to a separate status, which must be denied, not only to those who practise, but to those who teach, the various departments of practical medicine and surgery.

For political purposes, however, there is a still more important distinction that exists among the sciences themselves, according as they bear more or less directly on the relations of men to each other, and the laws which govern their social progress. There are sciences of matter, animate and inanimate, on the one hand, and there is a science of mind on the other, having its abstract expression in logic, metaphysics, and ethics, and becoming concrete in politics, law, and history. Now, though the material sciences are by no means indifferent to civilisation, and, indeed, the greater part of the progress which it has made in recent times has been in consequence of their cultivation, they still do not occupy themselves with its laws, and have rather the effect of turning the mind from, than directing it towards, their contemplation. There are ten chances to one that the most eminent mathematician, physiologist, or geologist of the day, has bestowed less consideration on the laws which govern social progress than his next door neighbour who, as a soldier, a merchant, or a country gentleman, does not belong to the learned class at all. Of the science of mind, on the other hand, these laws are the proper subjects, either in their abstract and universal, or in their concrete and special manifestations, and consequently are continually present to its students. If this view be correct, it follows that the social functions of a learned class can, properly speaking, be performed only by those who occupy themselves, more or less immediately, with philosophy or the mental sciences, and consequently that some proof of application to this department of study is indispensable in order to raise up a claim to a separate political status on the part either of an individual or a class.

From these observations it will be apparent, that the only claim to representation which, according to the existing arrangements of our Universities, we should be disposed to recognise, would be one founded either on the possession of degrees in arts,

or of literary or scientific University appointments; and that professional degrees, unless implying a previous examination in arts, should not entitle their holders to the privileges of the learned class. As regards professional teachers, if once admitted within the walls of a University, convenience would probably induce us to act on the presumption of general accomplishment, which their selection to this office by their respective professions would unquestionably raise up in their favour.

Such being the principles according to which it seems reasonable that a distinct political representation should be given or withheld, let us inquire how far they are in accordance, *first*, with the principles on which the suffrage was bestowed on the older Universities, and *second*, with those on which it is at present claimed by the University of London, or might be claimed by the Scotch Universities.

Both at Oxford and Cambridge, the constituency consists of "Doctors and Masters of Arts, whose names are on the books." The degrees of Doctor of Divinity and Doctor of Laws, it is well known, are only nominally professional, and when not merely honorary, may, along with that of Master of Arts, be taken as a fair criterion that their holders are really members of the learned class. Then as regards Medicine, the following is the regulation which we quote from Ward's Translation of the Oxford University Statutes:—

1834.—*Tit. 6, Sect. 5, Chap. 1.*

"It is enacted, that every person shall, before he obtains the degree of bachelor in Medicine, reside four full years, or sixteen terms, in the same manner as scholars in the Faculty of Arts, in the University, and that without evasion; that he shall undergo a public examination among the same persons, and subsequently to that examination, be bound to give his attention for three full years (*i.e.*, twelve terms) to the study of Medicine."

1850.—(*New Examination Statute.*) *Tit. 9, Sect. 2, Chap. 1.*

"It is enacted, in order that the Congregation of Regents may be the better informed of the learning and proficiency in literature of the candidates for the first degree, whether in Arts, or in Civil Law, or in *Medicine*, that every undergraduate shall submit to *two* examinations before he is admitted to supplicate for a *grace*, (for that degree.")

1888.—*Tit. 6, Sect. 5, Chap. 5.*

"It is enacted, that persons who wish to be advanced to the *doctorship* in Medicine, are to apply to the study of Medicine for three full years, subsequently to taking the degree of bachelor in Medicine, before they are admitted to acception in that faculty."

Ibid. Chap. 6, (*ad fin.*)

"Lastly, in order to supersede all question, we pronounce that all inceptors in Medicine are to enjoy the *same rights of voting* as if they had at some period become regents in Arts."

It thus appears that no one can take the degree of M.D. at Oxford until ten years after matriculation, and that four of these years must have been devoted to the study of Arts. Whatever may be thought of this examination in a medical point of view, there can be no doubt that it satisfies the citizen requirement.

At Cambridge, matters are not quite so satisfactory, but, even there, there is a guarantee which is not without value. "Before a student can become a bachelor of Physic, he must have *entered on his sixth year*, computed from the date of his first admission at the University, *have resided nine terms*, and have *passed the previous examination*."* This "previous examination," more familiarly known as the "little go," is no doubt of a slight description,—scarcely exceeding in its requirements the amount either of classical or mathematical attainment with which an average boy in England leaves an average public school. What we regard as the more important condition, is the lengthened connexion with the University, and contact with its influences which is secured.

At Dublin, the better arrangement of Oxford has been adopted, and there a B.M. must be either a B.A. of three years' standing, or an M.A. of two.

From this brief statement, it appears that the three Universities which have hitherto sent members to Parliament, have done so in accordance with the principles which we have laid down, and that, though a portion of the constituency in each case consists of the holders of professional degrees, these, engrafted as they are on previous degrees, or following on previous examinations, in Arts, are even a greater guarantee to the public, than the mere literary degree itself for learned habits and studies.

Let us now see how the matter stands with the other schools of learning in the kingdom, on behalf of which the privilege has been, or may be claimed.

The circumstance which led to the foundation of the University of London, will, we believe, be generally recognised by all existing political parties, as furnishing a sufficient ground for its claim to an equal parliamentary representation,—provided that it fulfils the conditions on which this privilege was originally granted to, and continues to be enjoyed by them. It had long been felt as a hardship, by a portion of the community, of

* Cambridge Calendar, 1853. P. 35.

great and constantly increasing influence, that, in order to participate in the privileges which that community had wisely set apart for its learned class, something more was required than those intellectual qualifications which all were agreed in exacting from its members. It was not enough that a man should be in a condition to discharge the citizen duties which the state recognises as an equivalent for increased citizen rights, it was further necessary that he should hold the creed which the state professed. Various unsuccessful efforts were made to remove this anomaly by throwing the old Universities open to dissenters, and at last, as a consequence of these repeated failures, in 1825, a joint-stock company was formed for founding a new University in the Metropolis. The want, which it was thus intended to supply, was so keenly and so widely felt, that the scheme was marvelously successful. Shares were taken to the extent of £160,000, a site was purchased; on the 10th April 1827, the first stone of the building was laid, and in November of the following year, the classes were in full operation. The first object of the proprietors was to obtain a charter, conferring on their institution the character of a University, with the right of granting degrees; but, after various negotiations for this purpose, they learned that the Government of the day had wider views, and their scheme was thus expounded to the council.

“Downing Street, 19th August 1835.

“It is intended by the government to take the following steps, with a view to provide a mode for granting academical degrees in London, to persons of all religious persuasions, without distinction, and without the imposition of any test or disqualification whatever:—

“1. The charter sought by the Duke of Somerset and others, will be granted, incorporating the parties by the title of ‘London University College.’

“2. Similar charters will be granted to any institution of the same kind, which may be hereafter established.

“3. Another charter will be granted to persons eminent in literature and science, to act as a board of examiners, and to perform all the functions of the examiners in the Senate House of Cambridge; this body to be termed the ‘University of London,’ &c.

“9. All bye-laws and regulations for the conduct of the University of London, to be submitted to the Secretary of State, and thus made subject to parliamentary responsibility.”

This well-considered scheme was carried into execution the following year; the charter, incorporating the new University, was sealed on the same day with that by which University College was incorporated, and the two greatest efforts for the organization and promotion of the higher instruction of which

the modern history of England can boast, were thus simultaneously consummated. For more than seventeen years England has thus possessed, in the older Universities on the one hand, and in the University of London on the other, as complete a system for ascertaining the extent of its learned class as is consistent with the genius of our institutions; and as the object of Government from the first, (as communicated to the Council of University College by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Spring Rice,) was to place the new University on a footing of "equality in all respects with the ancient Universities, freed from those exclusions and religious distinctions which abridge the usefulness of Oxford and Cambridge," it can scarcely be doubted that, if *political* equality can be claimed by its members on the same principles, it will be given to them on the first occasion on which a re-adjustment of existing constituencies takes place. If anything be required to render this event more certain, it will be found in the success which has attended the agitation for its accomplishment during the last three years. On the 16th March of the present year, a numerous and influential deputation, composed of senators of the University, heads or influential members of sixteen metropolitan and seventeen provincial Colleges, officers of the Graduates' Committee, principals of endowed and private schools, whose courses of tuition have been influenced by the University curriculum, representatives of medical associations in town and country, and sixteen members of Parliament, waited on the Earl of Aberdeen. In the memorial, which was read by Dr. Foster, he says, "It has been our duty to submit this matter to former administrations, and we received from Lord Derby the distinct assurance that, in the opinion of his Government, there was no claim of the kind which could come into competition with that of the University of London." In taking leave of the deputation, Lord Aberdeen went considerably beyond the usual courteous dismissal—"I do, in the most sincere and warmest manner, assure you that the matter will be taken under the most serious consideration of the Government. I beg you to believe that I am not by any means making use of mere words of course, but I assure you that such will positively be the case." If to such assurances from the heads of two administrations we add the repeated declarations of such men as Lord John Russell and Sir James Graham, that in any future extension of the franchise the claim of science and learning must be more extensively recognised, we shall probably be guilty of no rashness if we hold them as settling the general question, whether or not representation is to be given.

But, if we may judge of the spirit of the agitation by the

parties by whom it has been chiefly carried on, there is another question, scarcely less important, which will fall to be decided, with reference to the University of London—viz., whether the principle which has been acted on in the older Universities, of giving the franchise to the learned class only, is to be adhered to, or a new principle of giving it to a constituency composed partly of the *learned*, and partly of the *professional* class, is to be adopted. In the University of London, a medical degree means neither more nor less than it purports. Beyond the schoolboy examination at entering the University, which may be passed at the age of sixteen, there is neither examination, attendance, nor residence for purposes of general study imposed upon those who are candidates for it, and though an admirable guarantee for professional training, it is thus obviously a guarantee for nothing besides. But in the claim which was put forward by the deputation, no distinction was made between this degree and degrees in arts; on the contrary, the case was rested mainly on the number of medical graduates. Mr. Heywood, in introducing the deputation, said, that the University of London “included among its members the major portion of the medical profession in London, and it should be remembered that at present the medical profession could not be said to be represented in the House of Commons.” In the memorial it is set forth that the number of students of the University is estimated at 5000 annually, of whom nearly half are medical; and that the entire number of institutions from which the University receives candidates for degrees, is now one hundred, being thirty-two in Theology and Arts, and sixty-eight in Medicine. One of the members of the deputation who addressed Lord Aberdeen—the senior physician of St. George’s Hospital—seemed to regard the movement as one intended chiefly, if not entirely, for the benefit of his profession, and such, we have reason to believe, is the view which has been taken of it by the medical profession generally. Nor is it wonderful that such should be the case, for in every thing connected with the University of London, a decided preference is given to Medicine. In a letter from the Earl of Burlington, Chancellor of the University, to the Home Secretary, in May 1853, on the subject of the proposed alterations in the constitution of the University, we find the following recommendations proceeding from the Senate:—“That the qualification which should entitle a graduate to sit in convocation, should be a standing of five years for Bachelors of Arts, of three years for Bachelors of Medicine, and of five years for Bachelors of Laws, who have not graduated as Bachelors of Arts in this University, or the degree of Doctor of Laws, Doctor of Medicine, or Master of Arts.” For university pur-

poses, at all events, it would thus seem that three years suffice to give to the Bachelor of Medicine a maturity of wisdom to which Bachelors of Arts and Laws cannot attain under five, and that, even if the Bachelor of Laws should be, as he very often will be, a Bachelor of Arts of one of the ancient Universities! Now if the same qualifications were adopted, as the test of fitness to deal with political as with university questions, they would precisely reverse the principles which we have laid down, by giving, in so far at least as the bachelors are concerned, the greatest amount of influence to those for whose ripeness the guarantee is the smallest.

But we are told by medical writers, that "the University of London is, *par excellence*, the medical University, as Oxford is in a special repute for classics, and Cambridge for mathematics;"* that the medical profession regard it as "a University which is essentially their own;"† and it is on this account, we imagine, that a preponderance in all respects, and on all occasions, is given to the medical element. Now this statement, if correct, may be of some value as regards the management of the internal affairs of the University. If it was the design of its founders, and is the desire of its supporters, that the University should be essentially a medical school, there is no unfairness in the interests of medicine being considered, even to the prejudice, if need were, of the other faculties. But out of such a state of matters no ground of claim to the suffrage emerges in favour of the medical graduates, at least on the principle on which it is held by the ancient Universities. The Inns of Court are essentially schools of law, and the position to which the medical graduates lay claim, is precisely the same as would be that of those of their members who had not graduated in Arts, if they demanded a political equality with those who had, on the ground that law, as the preponderating element, was entitled to bear rule in these establishments. The claim of the professional class generally to a separate political status may be good or bad, (on that subject for the present we offer no opinion,) but it cannot be rested on the same grounds with that which, in the case of the ancient Universities, has been recognised in favour of the learned class, and can become identical with it only by the imposition of what, in the higher departments both of law and medicine, we should rejoice to see imposed—namely, a previous literary training. There is no necessity for professional graduates passing through the form, whatever it may be, of graduating in arts. The system which prevails at Oxford may be adopted in London, that, namely, of

* *Lancet*, 8th May 1852

† *Ibid.*, 4th August 1852

sending them in for their examination along with those who are to take the degree of Bachelors of Arts, and if they come out with a certificate of having passed it, the citizen qualification will have been completed, and their claim to the suffrage established as members of the learned class.

But another argument which is used in favour of conferring the suffrage on medical graduates, as such, is, that "the medical profession cannot at present be said to be represented in the House of Commons," and in proof of this assertion it is said that there are only two medical men who are members of Parliament, (Mr. Joseph Hume and Dr. Mitchel of Bodmin.) By some persons this line of argument has been carried so far as to form the foundation of a claim to representation on the part, not only of the medical graduates of London, but also of the College of Physicians, and the College of Surgeons. Now we regard not only the argument as unsound, but the statement on which it rests as untrue. The medical profession is as much and as fully represented in the present House of Commons as any other portion of the community, professional or non-professional, civil, military, or ecclesiastical, with the single exception of the learned class. If there are not many medical men in Parliament, the cause is to be sought not in any fault of the representative system, but in the peculiar character of the medical profession itself. The professional avocations of medical men, whilst they do engage in them, are entirely incompatible with parliamentary duties, and even were they willing to abandon them, it is not strange that they themselves should discover, or that their fellow-citizens should discover for them, that general studies which terminate at sixteen, and subsequent duties which confine their attention to the structure and changes of the human body, little qualify them for the senate. Even if the suffrage were conferred on them, as a profession, we question greatly whether they themselves would not soon come to be of opinion that their interests were safer in the hands of a well-trained lawyer, or an accomplished country gentleman, than in those of members of their own body. But the argument is attempted to be supported by the assertion, that there are many members of the legal profession in the legislature, and the fact is unquestionable. It is forgotten, however, that these gentlemen are sent there, not by their own profession, but by the general community, *the medical profession included*, and that they have no advantage whatever over any other citizen of the state, other than that which their professional and general training give them. If a man chooses a profession which withdraws him from a particular sphere of activity, however envious of it he may afterwards become, he cannot with reason complain that his fellow-citizens do not come to his assist-

ance and thrust him into it. A lawyer might as well grumble at not being made a bishop, or a statesman at not being appointed to a naval command, as a doctor sit down and bemoan his fate because he cannot in the general case be a member of Parliament.

Whilst we join then as heartily as any graduate of them all, in the agitation which is being carried on, in so far as it has for its object the extension of the franchise to that portion of the learned class which has been called into existence by, and now clusters round the University of London, we must reserve our expressions of sympathy with the professional part of the movement, till we have an opportunity of discussing it as part of the far more extensive scheme, which is said to be entertained in some quarters, of general professional representation.

The same reasons which thus exclude the medical graduates of London from claiming the suffrage as members of the learned class, operate with tenfold force against those of the Scottish Universities. Notwithstanding the celebrity which Edinburgh has so long enjoyed as a medical school, her medical degrees have not, for more than a quarter of a century, afforded even the slight guarantee for general accomplishment which is secured by the entrance examination in London; nor is it attempted to supply the place of a previous literary examination by any substitute however imperfect. There is no requirement of previous residence for literary purposes, no attendance on literary classes during the course of medical study, no school certificate required at matriculation, not even a limit as to age. The youngest and most ignorant boy may put himself on the books as a medical student, and at once commence that exclusively professional attendance which is to lead to his doctor's degree. At his final examination, we understand, he is required to give proof of a slight acquaintance with Latin—but this merely to the effect of enabling him to read or write prescriptions—and besides or beyond this there is no literary qualification whatever. "A smaller amount," says Sir William Hamilton,* "and an inferior quality of liberal learning is, in Scotland, required to qualify for the highest honours and privileges of the profession, than even in Ireland is deemed necessary for the very lowest; so that the medical aspirant who finds himself, from want of Greek, unable to rise into a Dublin apothecary, is obliged to subside into an Edinburgh physician;" and farther on, he adds, "medicine has now ceased in Scotland to be a learned profession; though even in Scotland learned medical men may be found, there is here no

* Report of the Royal University Visitation. Discussions, &c., Appendix III. p. 630.

longer any assurance not to say of superior erudition, but any guarantee against the lowest ignorance afforded to the public in a medical degree. Even English grammar and spelling are by the confession of Edinburgh medical professors, luxuries but not necessities for those whom our University proclaims to the world as meriting and having received her highest honours in medicine." In these expressions and opinions Sir William Hamilton is unfortunately but too well borne out by the evidence of all the most eminent medical men of the day, *who were not themselves directly interested in swelling the number of medical graduates.* Even by the latter indeed, the fact as we have stated it, is scarcely contested, and all that they attempt is, to account for it, and to palliate it on grounds of immediate expediency. In behalf of these "*Doctores indocti*," these "*φορτικοὶ* of Edinburgh," it is manifestly impossible to claim a separate suffrage on the ground that they belong to the learned class, and the idea of doing so, which was at one time entertained, has, we understand, been abandoned.

But what is still more deplorable is that, as matters stand at present, these are almost the only graduates whom the Scottish Universities send forth in sufficient numbers to form anything approaching to a reasonable parliamentary constituency. Degrees in arts are no doubt conferred by all the four Universities, but these from causes which Sir William Hamilton finds in the prevalent system of examination, are little affected by the best class of our youth. The Royal Commissioners in 1830 reported that the degree was utterly contemptible, and this most competent authority, in 1852, tells us that it is utterly contemptible still. But contemptible or not, the fact that it is contemned is sufficiently proved by the small number of those who, having passed through the curriculum of arts, and consequently being eligible, offer themselves as candidates for it—particularly at Edinburgh. For a few years a different system was adopted, and the standard of qualification was greatly raised. The experiment, however, after a short trial, was abandoned as a failure, and Sir William tells us that "the laurel is now again principally affected by a few humble intellects, of the humblest acquirements, especially by those resident in England, where a degree in arts is always of a certain reflected estimation."

It is out of this body however, such as it is, that a constituency must be formed, if the suffrage is to be given to the Scottish Universities as at present constituted. The degree of Master of Arts is a guarantee for a residence of four years, for purposes of liberal study, and of attendance, in their proper order, on the whole of the classes in the curriculum of arts; and the examination even as now conducted, certifies some acquaintance with the subjects taught. If the degree in such circumstances is

worthless, its being so is a proof, not that its possessors have failed to avail themselves of the learned training of their country, but that their country has failed to provide proper learned training for her children. Relatively to the community, in, by, and for which they have been educated, they are entitled, on the strength of having taken advantage of its highest literary and scientific training, to its highest citizen privileges; and this without any reference to the question whether or not their claim to citizenship, in the general republic of European letters, may be tenable. That the holders of Scottish degrees in arts are at present, for the most part, either Highland schoolmasters or English dissenting ministers, may be an unfortunate circumstance; but we hold it to be no ground for withholding from them, or failing to claim in their behalf, what is in truth one of the privileges of their order. They are our learned class; and until we can organize a better, we must make up our minds to acknowledge them as such. We must march through Coventry with our "tattered prodigals" in the meantime, as best we may, and take pains in future to recruit a more creditable batch.

It is no answer to this view of the question that there is a large class of persons in Scotland, not graduates of the Scotch Universities, who are possessed of an equal or larger share of learning and accomplishment than those who are; for these persons must fall under one or other of the three following categories, on behalf of none of which can the privileges of the native learned class be properly claimed. 1st, Most frequently they are graduates of the ancient Universities of England, and as such actually recognised as members of the learned class, not of Scotland, but of England. 2d, They are graduates of foreign Universities, have been educated at foreign schools, or in some way or other owe their acquirements to a residence on the Continent, in which case, *quoad hoc*, they are foreigners; or, 3d, They have been educated privately, or what amounts to the same, have declined to submit to the arts-examination, and consequently cannot bring their acquirements within the cognizance of the state, for any public purpose at all. It might not be impossible to devise arrangements by which a portion of these persons, at least, might be admitted to the privileges of the home-bred learned class. During the whole progress of our history, it has been so much the custom for Scotchmen to be partially educated out of the country, that we should only act in accordance with the spirit of our society, by recognising degrees proceeding either from the English or Irish Universities, or from such of the Continental Universities as might be selected for the purpose; and with reference to persons educated privately, the Dublin system of admitting to an examination without residence, might, under

certain considerations, be adopted. The main body of the learned class, however, in this, and every country, must consist of those who have received the highest literary and scientific training of the public educational institutions of the country itself; and if out of this body we cannot at present produce a satisfactory constituency, if we have (as we believe we proved on a recent occasion)* neither a learned class nor the conditions of its existence in the present social arrangements of Scotland, we must turn again to a subject to which we have frequently directed the attention of the readers of this *Review*, namely, the measures which are requisite for its formation.

Of the obligation which lies on every individual and on every community to form and maintain a learned class, as a mean toward his and its advancement in civilisation, and towards the fulfilment of that mission of development according to his laws, which the great Creator has assigned to all his creatures, we have already spoken so fully as, we trust, to obviate the necessity of all farther argument on the general subject; and if we shall again find it necessary to bring the shortcomings of our country in this respect into view, it will be for the purpose less of calling our errors, than of suggesting methods for their removal. Of these there are eight which occur to us as not unattainable, regarding the tendency of no one of which separately will there, we believe, be much controversy, and as to the efficiency of which collectively, we are persuaded no reasonable person will seriously doubt.

I. *The Suffrage*.—It is neither as a recognition of their historical, nor their actual importance, but as an incentive to their future development and activity that we should counsel the extension of the Suffrage to the Scottish Universities. The effect of such a measure would unquestionably be to enhance to some extent the value of graduation in arts, and it is obvious that to do so must be one of the first, if not the very first, object of those who strive after the formation of a native learned class. To the "*cui bono*" with which all Scotch students, as well of the prouder as of the lazier sort, at present respond to the recommendations of the professors, that they should come forward for the degree, it would be some small answer that, from the moment of their graduation, they, as members of what must always be a small, and what ought always to be a select, and consequently influential constituency, would, independently of all other considerations, become the possessors of a larger amount of

* See *North British Review* for May 1853, "The Higher Instruction and its Representatives in Scotland."

direct political influence than, in other circumstances, falls to the share even of the wealthiest commoners. Nor can it be doubted that something like a bond of brotherhood would thus be established amongst them. Here would be something that in after years they could claim,—a privilege which they would exercise in common. On the occasion of every election, circulars would be addressed to them, or visits would be paid to them by the more active members of their body, and out of such intercourse some sort of personal acquaintance would unquestionably grow up. Besides, one at least of their fellows, of those who had sat on the same benches, heard the same lectures, gone in and come out of the same examination-room with them, would be a member of the legislature, and this not as it may chance at present, as one of the independent accidents of after life, but in consequence of this very fellowship itself. To him it is natural to suppose they would go not only with their common, but with their personal interests in preference to the ordinary representatives of the town or county in which their lot might be cast, and something like direct and tangible advantages might thus, at least sometimes and to some of them, accrue from their connexion with him. But apart from positive benefits there would thus be something like a prize, beyond the empty name which would be attached to graduation; and those who will consider the relative conditions, in point of learning, of the Scotch and English ecclesiastical establishments, will scarcely doubt the value of prizes as an incitement to the cultivation of the higher mental gifts.

II. *A better system of examination within the University, and a better system of patronage from without it.*—We have here classed together two methods of amelioration, distinct in themselves, but having this in common, that they have both been recently treated by Sir William Hamilton so fully, and to our mind so satisfactorily, that we shall content ourselves with simply referring to what he has written;—adding, on our own part, one single observation, not by way of dissent, but of modification, as regards the latter. After enunciating the conditions of what he, and we along with him, regard as a sound and trustworthy system of university patronage, he says, “The principles thus manifest in *theory* have been universally and exclusively approved in *practice*. Precisely as they have been purely and thoroughly applied, have Universities always risen to distinction; precisely as they have been neglected or reversed, have Universities always sunk into contempt.” In support of this assertion he has drawn largely on his vast historical acquaintance with the subject, and we freely admit that in *all* the instances of the older Continental Univer-

sities which he adduces, the machinery of their patronage and superintendence, consisting of a board of trustees specially constituted for the purpose, "small, intelligent, perennial," may have greatly or even mainly contributed to their prosperity. But though we fully go along with him to his negative inference that *without* such an arrangement no University will flourish long, we are far from following him to his positive conclusion, (if he does so conclude,) that every University with it will succeed, and from this cause alone; and consequently that, by the formation of such a board of patrons, without other means, we should insure the prosperity of our Scottish Universities. In every one of the favourable cases which he mentions there were other favouring circumstances which co-operated with the system of patronage. In the three great Universities of Italy for example, Sir William himself mentions an institution which has greatly contributed to the success of the German Universities in the present day, and to the importance of which, for our own, we have frequently called attention in the pages of this *Review*; we refer to the presence of rival professors of different orders. "The endowed chairs were of two kinds—*ordinary* and *extraordinary*. The former, fewer in number, were generally of higher endowment than the latter. For each subject of importance there were always *two* and commonly *three* rival chairs; and a powerful and ceaseless emulation was thus maintained among the teachers. The ordinary doctors strove to keep up their celebrity,—to merit a still more lucrative and creditable appointment,—and not to be surpassed by their junior competitors. The extraordinary doctors struggled to enhance their reputation,—to secure their re-election,—and to obtain a chair of higher emolument and honour." Who can tell how much of the world-wide fame of Bologna, Padua, and Pisa may have been owing, not to their system of patronage, (which, for a portion at all events of the brightest period of their history, was in the hands of the students themselves,) but to this "ceaseless emulation," and to the encouragement which the extraordinary professorships afforded to men of learning to devote themselves early in life to the office of public teachers. The fall of the Dutch Universities, notwithstanding the continuance of this system of patronage, is also, we believe, not solely to be attributed to its adoption by those of Germany. To say that they have lost only their relative superiority is a cautious manner of stating the fact. It may mean much or little, but we believe we shall not understand more than Sir William Hamilton himself intended, if we construe it to mean that they have lost their pre-eminence altogether. Now, whilst their own system of patronage continued unchanged, if it alone was the source of their

prosperity, it is hard to see why such a result should have followed from an arrangement, which, late in the day, placed others in this respect on a footing of equality with them. All the advantages arising from a long previous adherence to the correct system must still have been on their side, and their established reputation would, *ceteris paribus*, still have enabled them to attract both professors and students with greater facility than their rivals. The truth is, there were many other causes for the change, amongst which perhaps the most obvious are the energetic cultivation and rapid development of the German language which took place during the eighteenth century, on the one hand, and the disuse of the Latin and neglect of the Dutch, on the other,—the increased patronage which the German princes, from the time of Frederick II., extended to letters generally, and the Universities in particular, and the decline of literary patronage with the declining national importance of Holland, which commenced in the civil war of 1787, and was consummated by the revolutionary war of 1793, and the subsequent train of political events. Our object in making these reservations, as we already stated, is not that we may give a qualified assent to the views of Sir William Hamilton on the subject of University patronage, but to guard our readers against the conclusion that, by their adoption in practice, all would be done that needs to be done for the Scottish Universities. A change in the system of patronage would no doubt be the cheapest expedient, in so far both as our own countrymen and the imperial exchequer are concerned; but whatever might be its efficiency in occasionally attracting teachers of greater celebrity than the jealousy of the existing professors might induce them to select, or greater fastidiousness than those who are willing to submit to the ordeal of election by a municipal body, we gravely doubt if, apart from other changes, it would ever be the means of furnishing us with a native learned class of much extent or importance.

III. *A change in the constitution of the Universities, by which graduates should be permitted to take part in their government.*—The change which we would propose in this respect, would be one similar to that for which the graduates of the University of London have been contending so strenuously since 1848, and which there is now every reason to think will before long be brought about by their endeavours. The advantages which may be anticipated, from admitting graduates to share in the internal government of the Universities, are very similar to those which we have mentioned as reasons for admitting them to the suffrage.

1. The first and most obvious effect of the arrangement would be, by increasing their interest in the Universities, to render a

permanent connexion with them more desirable, and thus to enhance the value of graduation.'

2. It would tend to bind the graduates together, and give to them the feelings of a corporate body.

3. It would introduce a new element of youth and freshness into the government of the Universities, which would have the effect at once of controlling the selfish views of professors, and the ignorance of municipal patrons.

4. It would probably be the means of inducing those Alumni who, in after life, became prosperous and influential, to promote the interests of institutions with which they had thus all along continued to be connected. It can scarcely be doubted that a large proportion of the endowments, from private sources, which have rendered the ancient Universities of England the richest in the world, would have been lost to them if their graduates had terminated all connexion with them at the moment of graduation,—or rather if, as is common in Scotland, their students had quitted them without taking any degrees at all.

IV. *A National Board of Examiners.*—A very obvious expedient for bringing about uniformity in Scotch degrees, and thus increasing the value of those which follow on a course of study at the provincial Universities, would be the formation of one Board of Examiners for the whole country, similar to that which constitutes the University of London, and the Queen's University of Ireland. Such an arrangement, if carried out by Scotchmen, and in conformity with the ideas regarding scholarship and philosophy, which were prevalent in Scotland whilst she held a place amongst the learned and speculative countries of Europe, would have the effect of perpetuating that distinctive intellectual character of the Scottish people, on the value of which we offered some observations in a former Article. Were such a scheme efficiently carried out, wherever a Scotch degree might rank as compared with an Oxford one in classics, or a Cambridge one in mathematics, the history of our previous intellectual life is a sufficient warrant for the hope that in Mental Philosophy it would take precedence of both.

V. *That graduation in arts be required for the Church and the Bar.*

1. *The Church.*—The full curriculum of arts being at present imposed on divinity students, we can see no sound objection to their being required to pass a corresponding examination at its close. If it be said that additional expense would thus be incurred, which divinity students in many cases are little in a condition to bear, all that is necessary is that some arrangement be made,

either by the Government or by the Universities themselves, by which the fees in their case should be modified to a nominal amount, and a certificate substituted for the actual diploma, as in the case of Bachelors of Medicine at Oxford. Again, if the Church should allege that it belongs to her province rather than to that of academical authorities, to ascertain the adequacy of the literary acquirements of candidates for the ministry, the reply would be obvious,—either that the present examination on entering the Divinity Hall might be retained, or that a certain number of clergymen, or theological professors, might, on such occasions, be admitted into the general board of examiners in arts. If this arrangement were adopted, the whole body of the Scottish clergy, both conformist and non-conformist, (or such portion of the latter at least as had been regularly educated at the Universities,) would be admitted to the academical suffrage, and a large, influential, and highly trustworthy constituency at once created around the Universities, by which means not only they and the general community would be benefited, but, as we humbly think, the Church also.

2. *The Bar.*—Such an arrangement, strange as it will seem to many, would, we fear, be opposed by much more formidable difficulties than those which we have been contemplating, were its adoption proposed even to the highest branch of the profession of the law. From candidates for the Scottish bar hitherto no guaranteed whatever for previous literary or scientific instruction has been exacted, and the examinations, on entering the profession, are, it is well known, little more than nominal.* It has been, and is, the common boast of the profession, (not, to our thinking, a wise one,) that with such entire freedom of access, the character of the bar in point of general accomplishment has nevertheless been high,—that its members hold a large proportion of the few learned appointments of Scotland,—and that they are more active in authorship, and enjoy generally more literary reputation, than any other class of persons in this country. But

* From the programmes of the courses of lectures which are being delivered at present in the faculties of law, in the Universities of Paris, Bologna, and Padua, we find that we have as little reason to congratulate ourselves on the condition of this department in the Scotch Universities, even as compared with these their models and ancient rivals, as we had on a recent occasion, when we contrasted our faculties of arts with those of Germany. In place of three professors of law as in Edinburgh, there are eighteen in Paris, seven in Bologna, ten in Padua, and in all of these three Universities there are chairs for the important subjects of the philosophy of law, international law, public law, and (for what is a department of the latter) criminal law, all of which, even the last, we most strangely neglect. As we shall probably have occasion at no distant period to recur to the very unsatisfactory state of legal education in this country, we shall content ourselves for the present with this simple indication of the fact.

if such be the fact, we are pretty certain it is so, not because of, but notwithstanding, the custom of admitting candidates without inquiring into their previous studies. The position of the bar has hitherto, if we mistake not, been maintained by three causes.

(1.) Most of the public appointments in Scotland of a valuable or important kind, whether strictly connected with the profession or not, have usually been given to its members, so that, unlike the national Church in Scotland, and the profession of medicine everywhere, it holds out many prizes to ambition. These prizes, however, if not given strictly according to merit, cannot, with decency or safety, be given to ignorant or vulgar men, and consequently the parents of youths destined for this profession have usually, from interested motives of the directest kind, been careful of their education.

(2.) The practice of the profession being eminently public, gross ignorance is liable to be encountered by the ridicule both of professional rivals and of the bench, and the class on whose favour success depends being composed of well educated *men*, is necessarily much less capable of being hood-winked than those persons with whom members of the other professions have too frequently to do.

(3.) A large pecuniary payment is demanded at admission, the consequence of which is that candidates usually either belong to the wealthier class, and have been educated as such, or are persons who can rely for their subsistence on their acquirements and abilities.

Now all of these causes, instead of being weakened, would be strengthened by the measure which we propose. Public appointments, professional and extra-professional, would be given with greater confidence, and less envy, to the members of a profession, no one of whom could by possibility be an uneducated man; the good effects arising from the public exercise of their profession would remain unchanged; and the same pecuniary qualification, if such were thought desirable, (and we think it would still be desirable,) might be retained. The only real difference would be that *one additional claim to consideration would be gained*, and gained on terms which ought not to be burdensome in a profession which no one is permitted to enter till he is major, that most persons do not enter till they are much older, and which ought certainly not to be entered by any whose acquirements fall short of what would be exacted for a "pass" in

* We have seen nothing better either as a guide to a "pass," or as a measure of its extent, than the "Manuel" which we have placed at the head of this article. Wherever an examination, of considerable extent, is imposed on a large class of persons, some such work as this, communicating precise information as to the manner in which it is conducted, in its various departments, is indispensable; and

arts. The only condition which here would be indispensable, and which in the other professions also, for the sake of preserving the peculiarly catholic character which has hitherto belonged to the national intelligence, we should strongly commend, would be the recognition of English, Irish, and trustworthy* Continental degrees, on the same footing as those granted within Scotland.

VI. *A previous examination in literature for Students in Medicine.*—To the imposition of the whole curriculum of arts on candidates for medical degrees, difficulties of a more substantial and permanent nature than those which we have been considering in the two other professions oppose themselves. In this case a long course of professional education is indispensable, and there are circumstances, against which it seems vain to contend, which render it necessary that it should be entered upon in general much earlier than most persons betake themselves to the study either of divinity or law.† The best arrangement probably would be that previous to commencing their professional studies, an examination should be passed in those branches of knowledge which can readily be imparted to lads under say 17 years of age, and that those subjects which call for the exercise of faculties which frequently do not appear till later in life, should be left to be studied during the course of their attendance on the medical classes. In this case, the first examination might be passed at entering the University, whereas the other, where such was desired, might form part of the final examination before quitting it. Such was the scheme suggested to the Royal Commission of Visitation by Dr. Davidson, one of the most accomplished members of the medical profession, in 1830; and though it would by no means put a Scotch medical degree on a footing of equality, as a certificate of general acquirement, with one granted either by Oxford or Dublin, it would

we shall hope to see a Scotch adaptation of the “Manuel,” so soon as our examination in arts shall have assumed a fixed and uniform character. In Paris, the art of “cramming” seems to be extensively practised, and judging by the “Manuel” we should imagine that, like most other arts in Paris, it has been brought to considerable perfection. Wherever you cast your eyes in the neighbourhood of the Sorbonne, they fall on some such intimations as these:—“Préparation à tous les Examens, Baccalauréats, Droit, Ecoles Spéciales”—“Fusignement préparatoire au Baccalauréat ès lettres et ès Sciences”—“Aux Examens de Droit,” &c

* We make this reservation in consequence of the fact that foreign degrees are still occasionally sold.

† For our own part we believe that little harm and much good would result from an arrangement which should prevent the Physician's degree from being granted, in the general case, before twenty-four, leaving the surgeon's diploma, as at present, to be taken at twenty-one. There would be fewer Doctors in this case, but, as Sir William Hamilton says, “so there ought.”

then be pretty nearly as good as a Cambridge one, and somewhat better than one from the University of London. Were this or any similar arrangement adopted, no great injustice would be done either to the general community, or to the other graduates, if Doctors of Medicine were then admitted to equal political privileges with those who had taken the degree of Master of Arts.

VII. *Arrangements for securing more effectually the moral and social training of Students.*—We now approach a portion of our subject which seems to us of the highest importance, and regarding which we have the more anxiety, because we are not aware of its having been treated by others to the same extent as most of the topics on which we have hitherto touched. It will not, we believe, be denied by any who are acquainted with the working of the Scottish Universities, that one of their leading defects is the total isolation in which they leave the student the moment he quits the lecture room. This fault, which is frequently, and, perhaps, not altogether unjustly, made a subject of reproach to the professorial system, is less felt in the smaller Universities of Aberdeen and St. Andrews, and we believe is in some degree counteracted by the constitution of the University of Glasgow; but in the metropolitan University of Edinburgh, it exists to such an extent as seriously to interfere with the usefulness of the institution. Here students from the country, particularly those of the humbler class, who for the most part have no other means of making the acquaintance of their fellow-students, and of the professors, than the arrangements of the University afford them, usually feel themselves as much strangers and aliens at the end of their four years' course, as they were at its commencement. Social intercourse, and familiar interchange of ideas and sympathies, even for the time being, to say nothing of those lasting friendships which, under more favourable circumstances, spring up so readily betwixt fellow-students, are here as little fostered by the juxtaposition of the class-room as that of an ordinary city church. Each individual hearer seats himself in his accustomed place to listen to the lecture, as he would to take part in the service, and if he has any communication with his fellow hearers, during its continuance, he of course commits a sin little less heinous than talking in church. In the ordinary case he quits, not only the lecture rooms, but the College walls themselves, when his day of toil is ended, without interchanging a dozen words with any one; and if, on the occasion of examinations, reading of prize essays, or the like, some little conversation does take place among the students, it is rarely to the extent of making their acquaintance out of doors. The humanizing inter-

change of almost brotherly affection, and the jovial and, for the most part, harmless intercourse which binds young hearts together, in the English and German schools of learning, is here unknown. The poor Edinburgh student celebrates with no songs his passage from the sterility of unconscious boyhood, into the rich and leafy summer of his days. In his solitary lodging he pores, it may be, over the pages which his professor has prescribed for his study; but his newly-found faculties are whetted by no friendly encounter with kindred wits,—his affections meet with none of the sympathy for which they yearn, and his passions take him by surprise, and often fill him with despondency. In this sorrowful sequestration from the genial influences proper to academic life, the better half of his nature seems given only to torture him and lead him astray. If he is gregarious at all, he shares his intellectual and moral bewilderment with a few of his former school-fellows from his native village, who have had as little opportunity as himself of gaining the freer atmosphere of thought and feeling which a wider society of young men never fails to conquer for itself. Dull, clownish, and sad, he is an object of ridicule to the more fortunate portion of those who sit on the same benches with him, and of no very well founded respect to himself. The best that can come of him is a book-worm, and in such depressing circumstances, it is not strange that even his reading goes heavily and mechanically along;—that the new thoughts which he encounters take little hold on a subjective nature so feebly stimulated from without, and that he goes into the profession (too often the Church) for which he has striven to prepare himself, by an amount of self-denial worthy of a martyr, with no better ground of confidence in his qualifications than that self-conceit which solitary mental toil is so apt to engender, even in minds originally modest, vigorous, and sane. But how is this cheerless picture to be reversed, and the sunshine befitting his age and occupations substituted for the shadow which has thus been artificially cast upon his life? The first thing which we must do is manifestly to restore him to the society of his fellows in years and studies, and, if possible, to bring him in contact with those who have enjoyed greater social advantages than himself.

1st, Debating Societies.—The only existing institution by which this is even attempted to be done is that of debating societies. By means of these something is even now effected, and by better organization they might, no doubt, be rendered still more efficient than they are; but under the most favourable circumstances, and more especially in the hands of very young men, they will be apt to degenerate into occasions for mere idle talking, to foster vanity and superficiality, and to take the tone

of their loudest and shallowest rather than of their ablest and most polished members. Were a good staff of junior professors and tutors attached to the University, it might be possible, by putting these societies under their superintendence, to give to their discussions, in a manner adapted to the altered spirit of the times, something of the character of the "disputations" to which our forefathers seem justly to have attached so much importance. By selecting or suggesting subjects of a properly academic character, by taking part in the discussions themselves, and occasionally inducing resident graduates to join in them also, it would not be difficult for a very small number of professors and tutors effectually to remove the character of triviality which belongs to these societies at present; and as these persons need not be greatly more advanced in years than the majority of the ordinary members, there is no reason why their presence should cause restraint or engender formality in the proceedings. But as we regard the formation of a class of persons thus intermediate between the professors as they exist at present and the students, not only as the most effectual means of improving the teaching of the Universities, but also of removing the social evils of which we complain, we must speak of them a little more in detail.

2d, *Junior Professors and Tutors*.—Wherever the professorial system has been properly organized a gradation of ranks has been recognised in the office. The common division has been that mentioned by Sir William Hamilton as existing at Bologna, into ordinary and extraordinary professors, to which, in the German Universities, a third class, that of the so-called "*privat docents*," (*professores privatim docentes*), is added. But the names are of no consequence, and the minuter arrangements as to the relations in which the different orders stand to each other must be varied to suit the requirements of the different Universities, and adjusted so as to jar as little as may be with their existing organization. What we want is the thing itself,—a class of men who will form a connecting link between the students and the professors, properly so called, who ought at all times to be the most eminent representatives of their respective departments, who can either be found within the country or who can be induced to come from abroad. Without neglecting duties still more important, and which can in nowise be delegated, it is manifestly impossible that these latter can ever see much of the students. The interests of science and of human progress forbid such a serious encroachment on their time, and even were it otherwise, their distinguished position, and, for the most part, their age, render anything like intercourse on equal terms impossible. But no such gulf divides the student from the ex-

traordinary professor. He is usually an aspirant to the office of the ordinary professor; but though his rival as a public teacher, his emoluments, unlike those of his superior, are almost entirely dependent on his popularity. If the senior professor is disabled from infirmity, or is so much engaged as to render it impossible that he should lecture, (as was the case with Guizot, Cousin, &c., in France, and with Schelling, Schlegel, &c., in Germany,) the ordinary professor supplies his place, either permanently or till some other arrangement is made; in the former case opportunity being afforded for another candidate for public favour to offer himself. The duty of conducting class examinations will naturally fall to the share of the extraordinary professor, and this he is in a condition to do far more effectually than it can be done by a senior professor. If his other arrangements admit of it, as they probably would in the smaller Universities of Scotland, it will be his duty to read privately with such of the students as either request his more special instructions, or as he himself judges to stand in need of them. In the larger Universities this duty would fall to be discharged by a third order of professors or tutors, (or perhaps occasionally by simple graduates holding a temporary appointment from the *Senatus Academicus*,) and as regards the whole of this latter class, their chief recompense would, of course, consist in the prospect of the distinguished career to which their office would be the regular and recognised entrance. A very small salary (say £100 a-year) would, in such circumstances, probably be sufficient to secure the services of young men fully adequate to the task. It is to this latter class of academical teachers that we would chiefly look for removing the social evils which we have mentioned as existing in the University of Edinburgh. If the humbler class of students had the privilege of reading with these gentlemen *gratis* in their rooms, there are, we are certain from the enthusiasm with which we know the poor fellows to be inspired, few who would not avail themselves of it, and the result would inevitably be an acquaintance of a very valuable kind, not only with the tutor himself, but with those who read along with them. Daily meetings in a private room of say a dozen persons at a time, where conversation would not only be admissible, but, if it had reference to the subject in hand, would be the chief medium through which instruction would be conveyed; and these meetings, presided over by a young, accomplished, and often, it is to be hoped, an elegant man, could not fail, if continued for years, to have a refining effect on the most boorish, as they could not be otherwise than inspiring and delightful to every one who was not altogether unworthy of entering academic walls.

3d, A Common Table.—We believe there are none of the ar-

rangements of the English Universities, the adoption of which would be more likely to add to the happiness and to promote the social training of Scotch students than that of a College Table, at which the professors and tutors, or a certain number of them, and such resident graduates as might find it convenient, should dine daily, and which should be open to all students at a very moderate cost. From the constitution of the Scottish Universities it is impossible that College Tables could be arranged in a manner precisely analogous to those in Colleges where all the students are resident, and under the control of the college authorities; it is a mistake, however, to suppose that the institution itself is incompatible with the professorial and non-resident system. For proof of this we have to go no farther than to Trinity College, Dublin, where a large proportion of those who dine regularly at the College Table do *not* reside within the College walls. But even if a small body of resident professors, tutors, and students were thought necessary as a nucleus around which college society might form itself, no very formidable obstacle seems to stand in the way of its foundation in Edinburgh. By far the greater number of students at present reside in lodgings, which are neither so comfortable, respectable, or economical as a well arranged Hall might very well be made, and to suppose that they would not willingly avail themselves of the offer of such a means of bettering their condition, is to suppose in them an aversion to improvement which we are not entitled to predicate of persons, for the most part, under forty.

In any attempt to introduce the custom of the Common Table into the Scottish Universities, the want of the beautiful dining-halls which exist in so many of the colleges of the ancient universities, and which add not only to their picturesque character in the eyes of a stranger, but what is far more important, exercise a refining influence on those who frequent them, would no doubt be severely felt. The present, however, is the age of the revival of Gothic architecture, and here would be as noble an occasion as could be found for calling the recovered art into play. But even though these, and many of the other indications of ancient wealth, were wanting for a time,—though both the hall and the table were of the plainest description, we feel certain that they would still confer important benefits on students, situated as we have represented many of those at Edinburgh to be. Though we do not altogether subscribe to the doctrine that

Carols, and not minced meat, make Christmas pies,

we are clear that

'Tis mirth, not dishes, sets a table off;
Brutes and fanatics eat and never laugh.

Nor, simple though, from the circumstances of many of those who ought to frequent it, such a table would necessarily be on ordinary days, is there any necessity that on festive occasions the sinews of the most substantial good fellowship should be wanting. The "brawne of the tusked swine," even "a fair and large boar's head upon a silver platter," might, without any very wanton extravagance, be "carried up to the principal table in the hall with great state and solemnity" at the merry Christmas season, and its appropriate carol—

"Caput apri defero
Reddens laudes domino," &c.,

would be as appropriate at the University of Edinburgh, as at Queen's College, Oxford, or in the Inner Temple.

4th, *An Academic Dress*.—The adoption of an academic dress would also, we believe, contribute towards giving to the students a corporate feeling, and generating an *esprit de corps* among them. It exists not only in the English Universities, but in the three older Universities of Scotland; and in all of them, we believe, good effects result from its use. The students of Germany supply its place by a grotesqueness of attire, which it is very undesirable that our students should imitate, but which, in the absence of a costume of their own, they very probably will imitate, should they ever gain sufficient confidence in their position to venture on a distinctive character at all.

VIII. *Increased Endowments*.—But these, and all other means which have been, or may be suggested, for improving the efficiency of the Scottish Universities, and forming a learned class by their instrumentality, presuppose the existence of increased endowments for the encouragement of learning, and the support of literary and scientific labourers. Even supposing other improvements to be separately possible,—which we believe them to be only to a very limited extent,—we are persuaded that they would prove utterly inefficacious if regarded otherwise than as ancillary to this cardinal amelioration; nay, we go so far as to think that were this one point secured, all the others, in the hands of an active people, zealous, as we believe our countrymen to be, in the pursuit of a higher moral and intellectual life, would very speedily follow as matters of course.

We recently treated at some length not only of the necessity of direct support being afforded by every civilized community, for its own sake, to the more recondite and systematic cultivators of literature and philosophy, the very nature of whose occupations exclude them from the support of popular sympathy, and also exhibited, by what we believe to have been a sound statis-

tical inquiry, both the comparative and absolute deficiency of our national institutions in these respects, and we have no intention of entering again on either subject at present. We must reiterate our conviction, however, that it is only by a development of the professorial system, that we can ever hope to see a better state of matters in Scotland. If we wait till we are rich enough to arrive at the possession of an efficient learned class by the circuitous route of endowing fellowships, not one out of every dozen of which, given as they must be by examination and at a very early age, can ever serve any better purpose than that of putting a well-educated schoolboy at his ease, we shall run no small risk of illustrating the old adage "*rusticus expectat*," &c. Let us fix upon the subjects the cultivation of which we believe to be indispensable, or conducive, to our progress as men and citizens, and assign to each of them one, two, or three cultivators according to their absolute or relative importance, and let us adopt for the selection of representatives of our highest interests such machinery, and hold out to them such inducements, as will ensure to us the services of those who are most zealous and able in their respective departments, and we shall in no long time, and at a cost which we are bold to say our fellow-citizens in the other parts of the empire will not grudge us, remove from our nation the only reproach which justly attaches to it at present. If we should then prefer a claim for the suffrage for our learned class, we shall be in a condition to support it by arguments which will be incontrovertible, because they have been already recognised, for three centuries, in the case of the Ancient Universities of England and Ireland.

ART. V.—1. *Dissertations on the Life and Writings of Herodotus*, by

- (1.) DAHLMANN. Altona, 1823. (In English, London, 1845.)
- (2.) HEYSE. Berol., 1827.
- (3.) JAEGER. Göttingen, 1828.
- (4.) BAEHR. Lips., 1835. (*In the Fourth Volume of his Edition of Herodotus.*)
- (5.) K. O. MUELLER. *Library of Useful Knowledge*. (Chap. XIX. of his *History of the Literature of Ancient Greece.*)
- (6.) KENRICK. London, 1841. (*In his Edition of the Egypt of Herodotus.*)
- (7.) SCHMITZ. London, 1846. (*In Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology.*)
- (8.) POCOCKE. London, 1850. (*In the new Edition of the Encyclopædia Metropolitana.*)
- (9.) MURL. London, 1853 (*In the Fourth Volume of his Critical History of the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece.*)
2. *De Thucydide et Herodoto Quæstionum Historicarum Specimen Scriptum* E. A. SAISON, Professor. Berol., 1851.
3. *Herodotus and the Athenians*. By the Rev. J. W. DONALDSON. December, 1843. (*Proceedings of the Philological Society, Vol. I., No. 15.*)
4. *Herodotus, Cho.* Book I, with a Commentary by J. W. BLAKE-LEY, B.D., late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. London, 1852. (*Being part of an Edition of Herodotus, which is to appear in the Bibliotheca Classica.*)
5. *Tales, &c., founded upon Herodotus*, by
 - (1.) Rev. W. ADAMS, M.A. *The Fall of Cræsus*. London, 1846.
 - (2.) C. E. MOBERLY, M.A. *Stories from Herodotus*. London, 1848.
 - (3.) J. E. BODE, M.A. *Ballads from Herodotus*. London, 1853.

THERE are generally three stages in the estimation with which an intelligent student of Herodotus regards his varied narrative. Beguiled at first, by the charm of style, and the winning grace of the narrator, into a nearly absolute belief, the result of a more critical scrutiny commonly condemns the reader to an interval of doubt almost as absolute; from which he will at last emerge, if he only pursues the needful examination far enough, with feelings of qualified, but more rational confidence,

in which a settled conviction of the good faith of his guide is tempered by the consciousness, that many of his materials were derived from very questionable sources; that the principles, which he obeyed in writing, vibrate somewhat unsafely between historic and poetic laws; and that, therefore, while the whole may in one sense claim the praise of truthfulness and goodness, the praise of trustworthy history can be conceded only to some portions of the work.

A similar fate seems to have attended on the Biography of the Historian himself. Drawn chiefly at first from scanty and remote authorities, the few facts recorded did really seem to fall together into a whole of very fair coherence, with a romantic colouring not unsuited to the subject. It read very much like a chapter from the Historian's own narrative,—a good companion picture to such tales as that of Democedes,—so smoothly had the compilers pieced together their materials, and so needless had they thought it to disturb our faith, by pointing out too carefully their own contributions, or disclosing the dubious character of the evidence on which the rest was founded. Such was Lucian's lively tale about that famous recitation in the Olympic Opisthodomus, when assembled Greece united to hail with acclamations the noblest record which Greek deeds had won, since the voice of the old Homeric bards was silent. Such too was the well-devised addition found in Suidas and Marcellinus, about the tears which started to the eyes of the young Thucydides, as he listened among that brilliant throng; tears held to indicate, that he was then vowing in his inmost heart, like the youthful Themistocles in those nights which were made sleepless by recollections of the trophy of Miltiades, to devote his whole intellect, and energy, and life, in emulation of such glorious fame. It is needless to recapitulate the endless contradictions which this narrative, self-consistent as it seems at first-sight, receives from every single external fact that can be brought to bear upon it; contradictions which form a list of all manner of impossibilities, chronological, moral, and physical. Good biography, since the date of Dahlmann's work, will furnish a sufficient account of them. It is some consolation, that the criticism which destroys this legend about the concourse by the side of the Alpheus, and the noble tears of Thucydides, has, after all, done less real injury to the *substance* of the Biography, than might have been expected. The real strength of every true "*Life of Herodotus*" must lie, not in these or in any similar details and ornaments, but in its picture of that true human character which looks out so pleasantly from every page of the Historian's own writings, a picture which no criticism can obliterate or even tarnish, while that speaking work shall last.

Just as in our personal knowledge of society around us, there may be some with whom we feel that we are tolerably well acquainted, though not a dozen facts in their past lives, beyond a certain point, may be known to us: so our hearty affection for, and intimacy with, the silvertongued historian, with his opinions, travels, tastes, and feelings, are entirely independent of any dry names or relationships set down in the dead dictionary of Suidas, —his parents, Lyxes and Dryo, his brother Theodorus, his uncle Panyasis, and his oppressor Lygdamis; and almost as independent of the livelier story furnished by the sprightly pen of Lucian.

But while thus prepared to content ourselves, if better may not be had, with what is left us, yet now that the hailstorm of criticism has somewhat lulled, we revive with a strong determination not to give up to the critics one fragment of personal narrative that can be rescued from them. What they have battled over may be at once *ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε*, and we shall certainly keep what we can. In presenting our readers then with a summary of the present state of controversy, on some of the more interesting questions connected with the writings of Herodotus, we shall not apologise for detaining them a short time in the course of them, with a few remarks on what has now become the less attractive section of the chronology and facts of his life.

We are happy that this subject will first enable us to do an act of tardy justice, by discharging at least a part of the debt which we owe to Colonel Mure, whose elaborate work on the Language and Literature of Ancient Greece ought long since to have received a more complete recognition from us. More than half of his fourth volume,—a space of above 300 pages, is devoted to Herodotus; to his life and times, his work and its materials, his treatment of his materials, and his composition and style. We have therefore to thank Colonel Mure for a complete exposition of the leading branches of Herodotean literature, as well as for much minute and often successful criticism on its separate portions. In this, as in his former volumes, the reader who looks to him for sound information, good sense, and conscientious care in weighing evidence, will seldom have cause for disappointment. But we must add, that there is much in his judgment of Herodotus with which we can on no account agree. We do not charge him with anything that would amount to general depreciation. On the contrary, the summaries of the chief points in the Historian's character, with which he more than once presents us, leave little to be desired.* The fault

* See especially pp. 212-3, 274-5, and 351. Compare also i. 52; iii. 210, 352; iv. 263-4, 272, 296, 343, 354-5. There are, however, many separate expressions in these passages to which we should object.

rather lies in his detailed remarks, which are often unnecessarily severe.* Indeed, he sometimes allows himself to place his own work in a false position, by shaping it to correct the partiality of former writers,—as if it must be deficient on one side, because they had been deficient on the other side; or as if he must apportion superabundant blame, to counterbalance their superabundant praise.† Upon the whole, therefore, he leaves the impression that, if a just, he is certainly not in this case a sympathizing critic; that he has not entered fully into some of the feelings by which Herodotus was habitually influenced; and that, in many instances, he has given less than their due honour to those literary excellences, by which Herodotus is peculiarly distinguished.

With regard to the life of Herodotus, all that can be assumed as clearly established may be summed up in this short list of facts:—that, though he used the Ionic dialect, he was a native of the Dorian town of Halicarnassus; that the main part of his life coincided with the period (B.C. 478-431) between the Persian and the Peloponnesian wars; that he accomplished a wide range of travels, the general bearing of which, but not their order, can be made out very clearly from his writings; and that he ultimately settled in the Athenian colony of Thurii, though it is open to doubt whether he accompanied the first settlers, in 443,‡ or joined them at some later period. The remainder of the old biographies rested chiefly on three pillars, all of which have recently been either shaken or thrown down; a definite date, B.C. 484, for his birth, which follows from an extract preserved by Aulus Gellius (xv. 23); and the two stories* to which we have already alluded, viz., the reading of the completed work at Olympia, (fixed in 456,) and the tears of admiration which it called forth from Thucydides. Dahlmann, the biographer of Herodotus, accepts the first of these statements, but rejects the second and third. Krüger, the biographer of Thucydides, defends (after a sort) the second and third, but throws doubt upon the first. Colonel Mure impartially rejects all three. We are ourselves disposed to hold, upon the whole, with Dahlmann, but to think that more than he allows can be established in connexion with the second and third. Viewed more widely, the three questions which they open up are these:—the chronology of the life and writings of Herodotus; whether any part of his history was composed with a special view to

* See nearly the whole of chapter vi.

† See pp. 352, 355, 451.

‡ We follow, for convenience, the familiar dates of Clinton, giving special notice however, if any point of importance is involved.

recitation; and how far, or how soon, his work was known to his contemporaries, especially to Thucydides. We shall begin with the second and third of these questions, as it will be found that they contain very important elements which bear upon the first.

On the subject of the Olympic recitation, we are disposed to agree with Colonel Mure, that Lucian's narrative, as to place as well as circumstance, must now be completely abandoned. But we are not so ready to give up the deeper foundation for that fiction,—that Herodotus wrote, in part at least, with a view to recitation, and that some portions of his work were actually recited. The account of a recitation at Athens, for instance, whatever we may say of those assigned to Corinth and Thebes, appears to rest on fair authority. Müller has remarked on the peculiar fitness of the style of the historian for such a purpose; the continuous flow of his *Λέξις εἰρημένη*;^{*} his loose clauses, carelessly conjoined; the freedom of his syntax from that perplexing accumulative construction, by which Thucydides, for instance, twists up into one hard knot what ought to be a dozen sentences. The dramatic form, again, which he loves to assume, is a similar indication; the vast amount of narrative, which, as Colonel Mure particularly notes, (p. 502,) he leaves those concerned to tell. We must anticipate a little by saying, that the criticism which Thucydides passes on earlier writers leads us to the same conclusion. His account of the principles on which they shaped their narrative, so that it might please an audience in an oral form, would precisely describe much that must be remarked in Herodotus, when due allowance has been made for the somewhat invidious colouring of the observation.

But this conclusion is connected with another. If written in any sense for recitation, the history must have been first composed and made public in detached pieces. It could never have been recited as a whole in the vast proportions which it finally assumed. Colonel Mure has taken the trouble to calculate this matter with great nicety; and it appears that, on the lowest computation, to recite the whole nine books would require six or seven hours a-day for four or five days running, (p. 262,) a lecture beyond all human endurance at any time, but most especially so at a festive gathering, under a Greek summer sun. On the other hand, should we be justified in assuming that the work was thus composed by piecemeal? We think so. We think that every part of the work gives signs of it; and most previous writers have taken a similar view. But the contrary

^{*} Arist. Rhet. iii. 9. Müller, Lit. Anc. Gr., p. 274; compare p. 268. See also Kenrick, Egypt of Hdt., pp. xi. xii. Slightly different is Mure, p. 513.

has been stated so positively as to make it right to give this point some further illustration.

Although Dahlmann thought that the historian wrote "at an advanced but green old age," his words do not seem necessarily to imply the more definite assertion, that he wrote the whole continuously as we now have it. That, however, is one form in which his theory might be represented; and it is the more necessary to examine it under that aspect, because it is the form in which it is set forth in the "Life of Herodotus" which is likely to be in more hands than any other of those enumerated at the head of this article.* On that hypothesis, we should have to believe, that Herodotus began at the beginning and wrote straight away to the end; that he neither revised nor altered, nor erased nor added, but poured out the whole tide of his collected treasures through one single channel, in one fluent stream. Doubtless it is just possible that this was so; if we had it on good authority we should scarcely like to deny it on its mere improbability; but that improbability weighs greatly when there is no such evidence at all. As to the ease of the composition, the reply is obvious; that perfect ease is the characteristic both of consummate skill and unskilled nature; harsh and awkward signs of effort being, on any theory of composition, the sole property of those intermediate blunderers, who have neither art nor nature pure. And let us attempt to realize the full character of this hypothesis; that after the historian has fairly started at those early quarrels between East and West, with the grand Persian contest full in view, he can still stop short, undazzled by its nearing glory, when any side thought strikes him, on any subject or of any hue; that he can tarry to pursue the vagary to its remotest consequence, darting ever and anon into all the subordinate bypaths that open amidst the windings of his devious road; that he can always, however, come back to the right place, glowing with precisely the right amount of enthusiasm, without having missed a single item that he wished to tell, or forgotten, in his intricate rambles, a single important fragment of his coming tale. What incredible power of composition,—what a supernatural skill in grouping, to arrange in memory all

* In Smith's Dict. of Biog. and Mythol., s. v. *Herodotus*. The hypothesis (that he wrote his work at an earlier time, and revised and added at Thuri) "is not supported by the slightest evidence; no ancient writer knows anything of a first and second edition of the work. . . . No one mentions that he . . . made two editions of his work, as some modern critics assume, who suppose that at Thuri he revised his work, and among other things introduced those parts which refer to later events. The whole work makes the impression of a fresh composition; there is no trace of labour or revision, it has all the appearance of having been written by a man at an advanced period of his life." It will be seen below that we do not object to every portion of this statement.

that mighty mass of tangled detail; no small portion of the whole body of historic knowledge which all the memories of all the men then living could supply; to appropriate it all, master it all, compare it all, sort it all out, and then at last, in advanced old age, yet light as earliest youth beneath the portentous burthen, to set forth with springy step, and follow out the preconcerted mazes of his journey, without making a single false step on the road. There may have been men who could do this; but no one has any right to assume it, so long as he can find a simpler explanation. And such is this:—that he first composed, perhaps one, or perhaps several, of the longer portions, which we could still detach as separate wholes; that with these he blended minor narratives, as his ever-growing stores of knowledge enabled him to add them; and that at last he bound them all together into this one peerless work, in which infinite diversity of detail is finally subordinated to a most admirable unity of plan.

How that plan would fashion itself in his mind through the slow lapse of years, the result, as we possess it, teaches. His main design would be, to raise a great historic structure, in which the memories of famous men might be enshrined. His guiding principles would be, to illustrate everywhere the constant influence of the unseen world; to proclaim man's obligation to walk always fearfully, yet firmly, as in the presence of superior natures, and under the authority of everlasting laws; at the same time to give a complete picture of the infinite variety, in small things as in great things, which extends alike over the destinies of men and states, and over the manifold productions of their earthly home. A man could no more write off such a work at once than he could build a Gothic cathedral by a single impulse. And indeed these two things are not dissimilar in other respects. Both are alike remarkable for gigantic proportions, for the many separate chambers which cluster round the central pile, and for the fantastic style of minor ornament, which, if sometimes graceful, becomes at other times almost startling and grotesque. Yet even the gravest of his narratives never clouds the history long with sombre hues, and never robs the historian of his cheerful and elastic buoyancy of spirit.

All this becomes still plainer if we admit that he wrote, even in part, for recitation. Which sections were first so written, it would be vain to conjecture. Let us imagine, however, (it is no more than hypothesis, but will serve perfectly for purposes of illustration,) that it may have been a sketch of the leading features of the Persian war. It is easy to see how different it would be from the completed work. Who can believe that the noble Greek, in the earliest rush of such a narrative, could have arrested his step at any of those myriad trifles, which crowd his

ever-changing page? Who can suppose that he would try the patience of his hearers, great as it was when graceful thoughts came clothed in their own bright language, by tales like these, of barbarous men and distant lands,—by details like those, of the eccentric magnificence of Babylonish or Egyptian kings? His first sketch, we may be sure, would carry his hearers far more rapidly than his later toils will let us journey, from the palace of the brilliant Greek-loving Croesus, to the starlike out-dartings of the little fleet at Artemisium, and the tenacious bravery of the men who combed their long hair at Thermopylæ, and the crash of the unwieldy, ill-assorted navy, which was shattered in the gulf of Salamis. Many a long year may have been spent in filling up the side scenes of the narrative, as he wandered on the shores of his new western home, and called up the thick-coming memories of the thousand wonders, which he had gathered on every island and headland round that storied sea.

This view of the mode in which the history was composed is corroborated by the expressions of Herodotus himself (iv. 30); and indeed by all the evidence which can be made to bear upon the subject. Such, for instance, is the general drift of these facts:—first, a circumstance which we have already mentioned, the length and completeness of some of the digressions, such as those on Egypt, Scythia, and Lybia,—the apparent irrelevancy of their minuter details being itself an indication of their independent origin. Next, the great number of narratives which seem insulated from the context where they stand,—which bear distinct traces of the widely different authorities by whom they were communicated, and which often contain assertions not quite consistent with those made by Herodotus himself in other passages, as would be very likely to happen if they were first written separately, and when conjoined, not smoothed over and fitted together with the care demanded of an author in more regular literary times.* In other cases, we meet with sentences that seem originally to have been mere marginal memoranda, which were afterwards worked into the text; an account which sometimes extends to whole chapters.† In one instance, at least,

* Compare, for instance, the accounts of the first voyages to Tartessus, in i. 163 and iv. 152. No doubt the passages may be made to tally, (see Thirlwall, ii. 108, and Grote, iii. 371-373;) but it is plain that, as Herodotus wrote them, the one is a Phœcean, and the other a Samian tale. Many of the contradictions pointed out by Colonel Mure must be explained on the same principle. And see especially his remarks on "inappropriate or misplaced episodes," pp. 483-465. Mr. Blakesley, in his new edition of Herodotus, of which only the First Book has yet been published, exhibits great ingenuity in tracing narratives of this kind to their different sources.

† See the remarks of the commentators on vi. 132; (if indeed that chapter is genuine, on which conf. Salomon, p. 15,) and Mr. Blakesley's notes on i. 56, 82,

we have clear proof, as Müller has remarked, that one portion was published before another, since the latter defends the former from criticisms that had been passed upon it.* And if the *μῆνος* mentioned in his epitaph, which drove him to take refuge at Thurii, was roused, as Dahlmann seems to have thought (p. 85), by some of his sharp censures on Hecataeus and the Ionians, we should conclude that those parts of his Second Book, in which especially we find them, had already been circulated in a permanent form.† Lastly, we might draw a similar inference from the singular arrangement of the facts relating to any one special town or country, exclusive of those which occupy the longer dissertations. Instead of presenting them, at any such opportunity as he liked best, in chronological order, they are appended piecemeal, just where they seem to have struck him, when he was drawing up the separate narratives; so that, when the whole book was compounded, the earliest facts sometimes found the latest notice, as may be observed of the curious ethnographical information which he gives with his lists of armies or navies in the Persian War.‡

To these considerations may be added the general consent of critical writers, (with the exceptions specified before,) though their views are cast in different forms. Some speak of separate *λόγοι*, which the historian spent his old age in combining:§

&c. Perhaps the singular omissions in the Sacerdot and Vienna MSS. may be deeper traces of this peculiarity. At other times, Mr. Blakesley regards these intercalated memoranda as ancient interpolations, as on i. 82, and again on 82.

* Namely in vi. 43, referring to iii. 80. *Müller*, *Lit. Anc. Gr.*, p. 273, note. So also *Krügler*. Contra, *Bähr*, vol. iii. p. 281; vol. iv. p. 384.

† See the passages in *Dahlm.* ch. vi. sect. 3; *Bähr*, p. 399; *Müller*, *Fragn. Hist. Gr.*, i. 21-23, *Didot*.

‡ *E. g.* of the Athenians; compare viii. 44, with v. 66 (the four old tribes), and i. 56, 57. Of the Ionians in general, compare vii. 94, with i. 146, &c. This can be tested at once by any one who will write out a consecutive history of almost any town or people, mentioned incidentally, from these scattered notices. The passages in which he does refer back to what he has said before would be perfectly consistent with this view; for sometimes they might be cross references from one detached book to another, and sometimes they may have been inserted when the whole was put together. On these, see especially *Mr. G. C. Lewis* in the *Classical Museum*, ii. 12-14, and *Jäger*, p. 11.

§ *E. g.* *K. O. Müller*, *Hist. Gr. Lit.*, p. 268. "It is stated that Herodotus recited his history at different festivals. This statement is, in itself, perfectly credible," &c., but "the public readings of Herodotus must have been confined to detached portions of his subject, which he afterwards introduced into his work," So *Heyse*, p. 75. "Maximas certe historiarum partes litteris jam tum mandatas in Italiam sequi attulit. Sed erant eae partes adhuc dissolutae," &c.; see also pp. 28, 42, 43, 47. (Conf. *Jäger*, p. 11. "Jam quidem multa sunt quae tanquam separati *λόγοι*, s. commentarii exarati fuisse videntur, ante totius operis confectionem;" which statement he proceeds to limit. See below.) *Heeren*, *Greece*, p. 268, note. "If Herodotus read not his whole work, but a part of it, (and probably it was composed piecemeal,) many of the difficulties which Dahlmann finds in

others prefer saying that he made an original sketch, which he kept under revision, and added to it as occasion served.* Not irreconcilable with these accounts is a third, that (perhaps from a very early period) he formed a definite outline of his future plan, which he matured and realized at Thurii† Others, with more boldness, divide the work into specified parts, and fix on one for the earlier recitations.‡ Others pronounce that there were two distinct editions, of which they think that they can still see traces in the present text.§ However widely these hypotheses may differ in other details, there are at least two points on which they generally agree: that the work of the historian at Thurii was at most only to combine and perfect; and, that there are good grounds for believing that he may have recited portions of his history at an earlier time.

If now we adopt the view which is thus found to be supported alike by probability, by evidence, and by a general coincidence

the narrative would disappear." Compare *Versneling*, Præf. fol. ii. who explains the well-known passage in Pliny in the following manner: "Condidit historiarum libros alibi, eodemque ante Italicum iter semel atque iterum in frequenti Græcorum mercatu prælegit; isthic vero illos eliminavit, nonnulla adiecit, alia fortasse rexit." Add *Donaldson*, Philol. Soc., i. p. 166. "The great work which he there composed [at Thurii] embodied the smaller books which he had previously recited or published." See also *Bähr*, iv. p. 182, note.

* E. g. *Mr. G. C. Lewis*, Class. Mus., ii. 3. "The ancient writers appear to have often kept their works under revision during a large part of their life. This was probably the case with the history of Herodotus." Conf. *Niebuhr* in Class. Mus., i. 187; Philol. Mus., i. 256; ("the edition which we read of" Herodotus.) *Böckh*, Public Ec. Ath., (p. 17; 2d Engl. ed.) Herodotus "composed or altered many parts of his history after his migration to Thurii." We may also cite *Colonel Mure* on this point, p. 258: "After a first draught was embodied, it may probably have remained on the author's hands," &c. Conf. pp. 271, 516. But he is opposed to the hypothesis of "successive editions."

† E. g. *Jäger*, p. 10. "In universum liquet, in opere hocce condendo certam definitamque Herodoti animo observatam esse descriptionem, certum ordinem rerumque seriem." Conf. *Salomon*, pp. 15, 25.

‡ Thus *Hayes*, pp. 42, 48, chooses the *First Book* as the most likely for the Olympic recitation. (See against him, *Jäger*, pp. 9-12.) *C. F. Hermann*, (in *Bähr's* 2d vol. p. 661; conf. *Bähr* himself, vol. iv. pp. 383, 387, 388,) expands this into the statement, that the historian may have first written and read the earlier books, containing the account of his travels, &c., and added the Grecian and especially the Athenian element,—viz., the wars with Persia, at a much later time. Precisely opposite is the conjecture of *Mr. Kenrick*, Eg. of Hdt., p. xix. "If we suppose that the portion which contains the Persian invasion was the first composed," &c. Similarly *Dr. Donaldson*, p. 167. "In a word, we are to consider Herodotus as one, who, having discovered his literary faculty in the brief epideixis which he wrote on the Persian War . . . spent the long years of leisure which he enjoyed as an Athenian subject, in grouping around that original centre the results of all his manifold journeyings and observations, making them all tend to that, and stringing every successive episode on the connecting thread of the international contacts of the Persians and the Greeks." The curious contrast between these two main views, illustrates what we said before, as to the hopelessness of any such specifications.

§ See *Mr. Kenrick*, p. xxv.; and against this view, the writer in *Squith's Dict.*, and *Colonel Mure*, as quoted above.

of critical opinions, the *place* at which Herodotus wrote will no longer be a subject for much debate. We may believe with Lucian, that he wrote in Asia Minor; with Suidas, that he wrote at Samos; with Pliny, who is at once the best authority, and the one whose assertion obviously embodies most truth, that he wrote at Thurii. But we must accept no one of these accounts exclusively. All are true; but the whole together falls short of the truth. If we look solely at the history, the three localities, with the scenery of which he is plainly most familiar, and from which his comparisons are usually drawn, are Ionia, Athens, and the south of Italy. In the latter district, as it has been frequently remarked, some passages must certainly have been written, at least in the form in which they have reached us.* But we do not offer this as a substitute for the authorities before recited. A more probable statement would be, that he wrote *everywhere*,—throughout the whole sweep of his travels. The acknowledged freshness of the narrative appears to us to indicate, that in very many cases, and perhaps in most, we possess the original records in which he first embodied the information which he received. Thus at Delphi and at Branchidæ, he would write down the legends connected with the gifts that filled their treasuries, and thence frame his narratives of Lydian kings. His minute account of the Persian satrapies, and of the motley host that gathered in the train of Xerxes,† must have been compiled while he was in close communication with subjects of the Great King. In Egypt itself he must have written down that strange series of facts and fables, which fills his second book and part of his third. In Athens he may have recorded many of the completer details of the Persian war. Marvellous rarities of art and nature may have been described where he first saw or heard of them, in many widely parted lands. Nay, many a chapter may have been written nearly as we read it, just after he had gleaned its contents from the talk of the caravansary, or from the listless tales of

Ionia; cf. i. 142; ii. 10, and especially his copious references to Samos.

I prefer to

of Herodotus to make us believe that he had ever visited the ground of Marathon," iv. 465.) *Italy*; iii. 131—138; iv. 15, 99; v. 44; vi. 21, 127.

† The notion of Heeren, that the list of this army may have been taken from the documents mentioned in vii. 100, is called by Bp. Thirlwall "an ingenious and probable conjecture" (ii. 254), but rejected by Mr. Grote, who thinks that it was obtained from Greek informants, v. 51, note. Colonel Mure thinks that the account of the satrapies "must have been drawn from original Persian documents, illustrated probably by some species of plan," p. 310. We do not pass any opinion on these suggestions: but simply assert that his informants, if Greeks, must have been in close connexion with the Persian authorities: and that he probably wrote these passages, when himself not far from the Persian rule.

sailors, as they were voyaging together amidst the isles of the *Ægean*, or from the more business-like narratives of merchants, with whom he was passing to and fro amidst the eighty daughters of Miletus, which girdled with their friendly resting-places the shores of the once Inhospitable Sea. The details of the account which we have thus given, must of course be hypothetical: but we put forward the whole statement, less as a mere "speculation," than as the best and completest method of reconciling and harmonizing the authorities and facts.

This view, again, greatly simplifies the question, as to his relations with Thucydides. Without entering further than we can help into that controversy, we may state generally, that there are insuperable difficulties against concluding, either that Thucydides was entirely ignorant of the works of Herodotus, or that he knew them in their present form. But there is nothing to hinder us from believing,—rather there is much to induce us to believe,—that Thucydides was acquainted with some parts of them, which had been previously recited or circulated; and, perhaps also, as we shall see grounds for thinking, with their general scope and sphere. Dahlmann's long list of passages (ch. ix. § 1), adduced to prove that Thucydides would have corrected or enlarged some of his own statements if he had known the writings of Herodotus, is utterly powerless against this more probable explanation. We can tell neither how much he knew, nor whether what he did know had then assumed, in each case, the form with which we are familiar. But that part of what he heard had done so, rests on the proof of his own quotations. Let us take what he says in i. 20-22, compared with i. 97. Not to dwell now on the circumstance, that the whole tone and colouring of the first passage indicate, that Thucydides had in his eye some earlier writer, distinguished by precisely the qualities which the congenial reader accounts beauties in Herodotus, but which a contemporary historian, so profoundly dissimilar as Thucydides, was not unlikely to consider faults;* it is scarcely possible to sup-

* So little can we agree with Colonel Mure's remark, p. 259, note, "The notion that another passage of Thucydides (i. 22, *in fine*) also contains a sneer at Herodotus appears somewhat far fetched." We might not rest much on the scholiast, with his thrice-repeated *αἰνέσεις εἰς Ἡρόδοτον, ὡς Ἡρόδοτος αἰνέσεις, αἰνέσεις δὲ καὶ Μυθῶν Ἡρόδοτον*. But almost every expression seems to us to bear only the interpretation which we have given to it above. On the general subject, it will be enough to refer (besides Dahlmann) to Göller, *Vik. Thucyd.*, pp. 43-42; and the *Tragedy of Salomon* named at the head of this article, especially p. 17, &c.; compare too *Hægel*, pp. 36, 46. We shall see hereafter, that the passage, *Hdt.* vi. 98, was probably written too late to be known to Thucydides, who could not therefore intentionally contradict Herodotus about the Delian tale, as some have thought, in ii. 8. Müller's view, therefore, (*Dor.* i. 332), that there were two earthquakes, and that each historian had only heard of one, may, strange as it seems, be more

pose, that the two errors (if such they be) which he charges against "the other Greeks," (in distinction to the mass of the Athenians, whose ignorance of their own history he had just been condemning) can have met in any other writer, as we know that they meet in Herodotus (vi. 57; ix. 53). It is absurd, for instance, to refer them, with Müller, to Hellanicus, when we know that Herodotus made both mistakes, and have no proof whatever that Hellanicus made either.* On this point, too, the other passage (Thuc. i. 97) furnishes important evidence. Thucydides there pointedly distinguishes between Hellanicus, whom he blames for *one* kind of imperfection, and some other earlier writers, who laboured under *another*. These latter had treated, he says, of the Median (i. e. Persian) wars and the Greek affairs which preceded them; but their writings gave no information on the rise of the Athenian ἀρχή,—a deficiency which he proceeds to supply. This passage really seems peculiarly conclusive. It states accurately enough the main subject on which Herodotus *did* write, which may easily have been thus far known to Thucydides. It marks as accurately one of the chief subjects on which he did *not* write; namely, the history of the Greeks below the Persian war. And there is no possibility of any confusion with Hellanicus, since he is expressly named and set aside under a different head.

Again, there is no such glaring injustice in the criticism of Thucydides, as to force us to the conclusion, either that he refers to some other writer, or that he treats Herodotus in an ungenerous spirit. To take the strongest passage of all,† on which Dahlmann comments with some energy; it is possible that to a writer with so rigorous a habit of analysis as Thucydides possessed, Herodotus's style of investigation *would* seem slovenly. It was not the custom of the Great Historian to propound a series of discordant opinions all at length, instead of condensing what was true in them into one brief statement; nor to dismiss disputed subjects with an inconclusive χαίρω, (Hdt. ii. 117; iv. 96,) for other equally uncertain topics. And it was not within the power, any more than within the wish, of the Great Logographer, amidst all his inquisitive voyages and travels, to scan

correct than that of Voss, given by Thirlwall, lii. 124. But on this subject, again, see the discussion in Salomon.

* Müller, Dorians, ii. 106, note. Salomon, p. 28.

† Οὗτος ἀμελεστώτερος τοῖς πολλοῖς ἢ ζήτησις εἰς ἀληθίαν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερὰ μᾶλλον ἐρίσσει. I. 20, fin. See Dahlmann, p. 160. Mr. Bode, one of the most devoted of Herodotus's admirers, has expressed well what Thucydides would feel far more strongly: "A kind of dreamy inconsequence often blends with an appearance and evident intention of exactness and investigation; we feel as if a great deal had passed before our eyes, but had only left a vague and not very definite impression of grandeur and antiquity."—Ballads from Hdt., p. 38.

men, their acts and motives, with the other's cold and penetrating eye.

To revert now to the story of those youthful tears. The belief that in the passages to which we have alluded Thucydides refers to Herodotus, is not of itself inconsistent with an acknowledgment of that early admiration. The youthful reverence, which looks up with a loyal and hearty respect to all intellectual superiority, often becomes sadly diminished by the discrimination of maturer years, and narrowed, or even warped, by the exclusive tendency of special occupation. The great objection to the story is, that the evidence is wholly wanting. We do not see on what grounds we could retain our belief in that incident, after we have abandoned the tale of Lucian, out of which it naturally grew. But to go so far as to say that Thucydides knew nothing of Herodotus, is clearly, we repeat, against the evidence; and the intermediate account which we have suggested seems to be the one which most satisfactorily fulfils all the conditions of the problem.

We may here allude to another literary connexion, which has excited much interest,* but which Colonel Mure dismisses very summarily: that which is said to have existed between Herodotus and Sophocles. We will commence by placing side by side the verdicts of Colonel Mure and Mr Grote:—

Grote, viii. 443.

Mure, iv 273, Note.

"In Sophocles, we may trace the companion of Herodotus. (*Note*.) The comparison of *Hdt.* iii. 119, with *Soph.*, *Antig.* 905, proves a community of thought which seems to me hardly explicable in any other way. Which of the two obtained the thought from the other, we cannot determine. The reason given, by a woman whose father and mother were dead, for preferring a brother either to husband or child,—that she might find another husband and have another child, but could not possibly have another brother,—is certainly not a little far-fetched."

"The correspondence between one or two incidental facts or sentiments, in passages of Herodotus and Sophocles, affords no sufficient evidence of a personal acquaintance between the authors, or even of a knowledge of each other's works; the facts or sentiments being themselves precisely of a nature to have obtained popular currency in those days. *Antig.* 909, cf. *Hdt.* iii. 119. *Ced. Col.* 339, cf. *Hdt.* ii. 35."

So then, it seems, we must seek for other evidence. And it is singular that Colonel Mure, taking the negative side, should not even allude to some of the weightiest that has been brought forward. Such is the poem of which Plutarch has preserved a fragment, and which purports to have been addressed by Sophocles to Herodotus in (what would be) the year 440, B.C.

* See especially the *Dissertations of C. F. Hermann*, at the end of the 2d vol. of *Bähr's Herodotus*, p. 656; and of *Dr. Donaldson*, in the *Papers of the Philological Society*, vol. i. p. 161.

* Γυδῆν Ἡροδότῳ ταῦξεν Σοφοκλῆς ἐνίων ὦν
πίντ' ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα *

It is true that Plutarch brings in the story "by the head and shoulders," as Müller observes; and the opinion which others have expressed is not unlikely, that the whole passage where it stands, is a mere marginal note, which has been transferred to the text. But the verses have been generally received as genuine; and bearing so definitely as they do, both on chronology and on literary history, they have played an important part in the biographies of both the historian and the poet. But to leave this point; the parallels between the two writers are far too numerous and striking to be so speedily disposed of.

We admit that something must be allowed for the spirit of the age or nation, which both alike would fully share. Therefore, *if it stood alone*, we should not lay much stress on such a passage as that in *Œd.* Col. 1225-8, where Sophocles uses the familiar saying, that it is best not to be born, and next best, having been born, to die. Herodotus has many passages which turn on a similar thought: as the tale of the Trausi (v. 4), who lamented at the birth, and rejoiced at the funeral of their friends; the tale of Cleobis and Biton (i. 31), to whom the gods granted a calm and early death, as the best boon that piety could merit; and the dialogue between Xerxes and Artabanus (vii. 46), when his adviser told the king, who was weeping to think how soon every man throughout his myriad host must die, that no living man is so happy as not sometimes, yea oftentimes, to have wished rather to die than to live. But no saying seems to have had a wider influence than this.† There was one account of its origin, for which Plutarch quotes the authority of Aristotle, which we may be sure had never reached Herodotus; that Silenus bestowed this truth upon his captor Midas.‡ Herodotus certainly would not have intentionally omitted a story, which would have cast the very hue he loved over those gardens under the cold cliffs of Bermius, where the sixty petalled roses grew, and where king Midas caught Silenus (viii. 138).

Admitting all this, we repeat that there are many other pa-

* Plut. *an Seni*, &c. Opp. ii. (Mor.) p. 765, B. Xyl. For comments and references in regard to it, see Heyse, p. 66; Jager, p. 23; Hermann in Bahr, ii. 659, and Bahr himself, iv. 386; Kenrick, p. 23; Salomon, p. 17; Müller, *Lit. An. Gr.*, p. 339; Donaldson, l. l. p. 161, and in ed. of *Antigone*, pp. xvii. 202; Smith's *Diet. Biog.* iii. 867; Pococke, p. 246. With respect to the passage in the *Antigone*, Valckenauer's arrangement of the clauses is sufficient to convince even the most sceptical of the connexion between the two writers; but we are not sure that Dr. Donaldson has induced us to resign altogether the old opinion, that Sophocles was the copyist.

† See the mass of quotations in Grotius's note on *Eccles.* iv. 3, and Davis's note on *Cic. Tusc. Disp.* i. 48.

‡ Plut. *Consol. ad Apoll.* Opp. ii. p. 115. D.

rallies* which confirm the natural view of that in the Antigone, even if the Egyptian fact of Œd. Col. 337 might have reached the two writers through independent channels. Such are the passages in which both combine the words *θεία τύχη*, like the *forte quoddam divinitus* of Livy (i. 4), as if to recognise the constant control which providence exercises over what men call accidents and chances.† Such are the passages at the end of the Œd. Tyr. and the beginning of the Trachiniæ, where the poet expresses the same opinion which the historian puts into the mouth of Solon (i. 32), that we must call no man happy, till we know that his life has ended happily.‡ But indeed there is the same close conformity between them on all those mysterious subjects which exercised so powerful an influence over both their minds. Let us take the one point of what Sophocles calls *ὑβρις*, § let us take, for instance, the three specimens of *ὑβρις*, developed in succession, like successive waves of human pride, in the Œdipus Tyrannus, with the issues which he furnishes elsewhere. First Jocasta, hard, domineering, defiant—swelling into scorn for the oracles which Greece held sacred: for whom, on the discovery of her unspeakable disaster, there was no place for repentance, no return to the placid course of daily life. Then Œdipus, the sagacious and manly, the reader of all riddles save his own; scarcely less impious, just when the tide swells highest, yet even then timid in his doubts of heaven; one whose quick temper and stern tone can do no more than slightly qualify our admiration for his kingly qualities: he too, rises and falls—rises not to such firm impiety, sinks not to such abrupt despair. Then Creon, first the supple plausible subject, afterwards the unfeeling tyrannizing lord: a baser character, but at first with less marked signs of evil, crushed out at last by still deeper and more degrading sorrow. Who can fail to see here the sort of figures which Herodotus most loved to draw? The intellectual difference is wholly in the poet's favour. He has a deeper insight, and a

* Dr. Donaldson has collected several, p. 164; cf. Varronianus, p. 12. We may add here, the common allusion to the Homeric *τοὶ ἔργου ἀκμῆς* (Il. E. 173) by Herodotus (vi. 11) and Sophocles (Antig. 996, *τοὶ ἔργου τύχης*). Compare too the turn of the expression in Hdt. i. 57 with Œd. Tyr. 536, &c. The commentators have suggested many other parallels, the weight of which depends on their *concurrent* force.

† Hdt. i. 126, &c. See Valeken. note on iii. 153; Bähr, vol. iv. pp. 412-3; and compare Gronov. on Liv. i. 4. For Sophocles, see especially Fragm. Eriph. 4 (No. 205, Dind.), Œd. Col. 1555, and Philoct. 1816. Similarly Pindar, more than once.

‡ Compare also the concluding words of Solon in Herodotus, *οὐδὲν γὰρ δὴ ἀνθρώπου ἀφ' ὧν εὖ ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπων*, with Soph. Œd. Tyr. 1190, &c.

§ Œd. Tyr. 373, &c. (The commentators who think that in this noble passage the poet departs from his immediate subject, understate the full meaning of the word.) We are not in this instance comparing a mere similarity of expression, but for the usage of Hdt. cf. i. 100, ii. 32, iii. 48, 81, 118; and the *αἴψα, ὑβρις* *viz.*, of the oracle in viii. 77. See parallels in Donalds. New Crat. p. 517.

more commanding power. There are niceties in his delineations which go far beyond the historian's simpler skill. But what a harmony of *moral* tone! How do the characters of Sophocles remind us of the fate which darkened the brilliant stars of Croesus, Polycrates, and Xerxes; of the meet judgment that destroyed the blood-stained Pheretime (iv. 205); of the retribution awarded to Cyrus, to Cambyzes, to Cleomenes; of the doom which drove Mycerinus to that strange despair, the short span of life doubled only for the revel, in which he buried his old love of justice, that could not buy off the wrath of heaven (ii. 133). When all these marks of a community of feeling and belief are added to the positive evidence which has been adduced before, we can no longer doubt the existence of a literary connexion, and apparently also a personal friendship, between these two writers—the most Homeric of tragedians, and the most Homeric of historians; * the two Greeks in whom, beyond all others, save that mightier epic poet, their nation presents us with the completest exponents of all sides of life; who combined most equably the two profoundest principles in our present being—fellowship with man, and reverence for God.

We turn now to the other subject on which we proposed to offer some remarks, the chronology of the life and writings of Herodotus. On this head, we should of course look to his own works to help us; but they render less aid than we might have hoped for, because of one peculiarity in the historian's character, viz. that notwithstanding his simplicity and openness, he seems instinctively to avoid any notices that could connect his narrative with his own private history. This is one of the many features in which, as we have observed before, he reminds us of Homer, in whose hexameter, as Mr. Grote remarks (i. 488), "the poet is a mere nameless organ of the historical Muse." It is a feature, again, which, like many others of his characteristics, connects him rather with the "olden time," than with the busy self-asserting contemporaries of Pericles.† There is nothing whatever of *prudery* in this reserve. On the contrary, he habitually speaks in the first person; habitually records his own thoughts, researches and conclusions, his own travels, observations, and (in general terms) authorities; but all in strict relation to his subject, and never to himself. "He who was present everywhere," says Dahlmann (p. 54), "is almost always absent

* "Qui Longino [c. xiii.] dicitur 'Ομαρειώτατος Herodotus, Homerum quem Polesio [ap. Diog. L. iv. 30] vocabat Tragiceum, Homorem certe magnificentissime proximum Sophoclem habuit in deliciis." Valcken. in Hdt. iii. 119.

† Compare Mure, pp. 355, 503; and on the general subject stated above, p. 244. If Herodotus son of Basilides (viii. 132) was a connexion of the historian's, as some have thought, this would be the only exception to his usual silence.

in his book; and when he does appear, it is only to be doubly missed afterwards."

Of course this peculiarity limits the use of his writings in the way in which we should now wish to employ them. Not the slightest allusion can be detected to events which must have exercised the greatest influence over his own life, as though he would show his love for the places with which he was most familiar, by burying their present in their past. Thus in the case of Halicarnassus; we hear much of Artemisia, but not one word of her son Pisindelis* or her grandson Lygdamis, with the latter of whom his biographers represent the historian as in personal feud. In the case of Samos, where he seems to have spent much time, we might draw up nearly a complete early history of the island from his writings,—from the old king Amphicrates, to the splendid tyranny of Polycrates and the desolation of Syloson, with multifarious details of its arts and artists, its wondrous structures, its commerce and its worship; but there is no reference whatever to the Samian war of 440, at which some think he was actually present, and with the whole history of which he could not fail to be familiar. Thurii, the home of his later years, is never mentioned in our present text,† though he speaks minutely and feelingly about the fate of Sybaris, near the site of which it was founded (v. 44-5, vi. 21). In a similar spirit, he rarely specifies the *names* of his authorities; and there are only two good instances in which they have any bearing on his own date or chronology.‡

It is another phase of this peculiarity, that while his pages *bristle* with allusions to all kinds of earlier incident,—as well the dim movements of Mysians and Teucrians before the Trojan war, the forays of Scythian and Cimmerian hordes, or the wild irruptions of half-mythical Encheleans, as the general facts of both Greek and Oriental history,§—these incidental references begin to run short as soon as we look below the siege of Sestos, which, though it forms the limit of his direct narrative,|| took place

* In vii. 99, he only speaks of Artemisia as ruling *αυτὴς ὡδὲκρονος νυνίαν*.

† The only possible exception would have no bearing on these remarks, viz. the reading *Ἡρόδοτος Θούριον καὶ ἱερὸν ἐκείνης*, preserved in Aristotle's *Rhet.* iii. 9.

‡ Namely, ix. 16, where he quotes Thersander, who had been present at a banquet given to Mardonius in 479; and iii. 55, where he mentions that he once met at Sparta with the grandson of a Spartan who took part in the expedition against Polycrates in 528 (Müller) or 525 (Clinton). The few other places in which he gives names furnish no sort of help on this subject.

§ There are some singular exceptions, such as the earlier Messenian wars, his silence on which has been explained on different grounds. What Niebuhr says on such omissions must be confined to his *direct narrations*. If applied to his *mere allusions*, it would be stated too strongly.—*Lectures on Anc. Hist.*, i. 168.

|| We shall not enter on the question whether the history, as we possess it, is a finished work, further than to state our entire agreement, on this point, with the

when, on the common calculation, he was only five years old. If we consider the stirring character of his own times, we cannot regard this as accidental. It is evidently one of his principles,—another point in which he is strongly contrasted with Thucydides,—to keep his narrative in every way at a distance from himself. That principle, however, could not possibly be applied so rigorously to his times as to his personal history; and the exceptional cases in which we can detect references to events later than B.C. 478, furnish the basis for some calculations on the chronology of his writings, which may be connected with that of his life. Dahlmann gave a list of the more important passages, which, though not complete,* has formed an essential part of all more recent biographies. In proceeding to examine it, we shall first inquire how it affects the literary question, of the date at which the historian wrote.

The following have been the chief conclusions on this subject:—Dahlmann brought down the date of composition to B.C. 408, or even later: Niebuhr, believing that Dahlmann had extended the life of Herodotus too long, assigned the work to Ol. 90 (B.C. 420): Müller doubted whether it could be proved that he lived into the second period of the Peloponnesian war (*i. e.* past 421): and Mr. Grote maintains that “it cannot be shewn that there is a single event of precise and ascertained date, alluded to in his history, later than” 430.† Colonel Mure shall speak for himself:—

“That Herodotus survived to nearly the close of the fifth century B.C., may be inferred from passages of his work (i. 130; iii. 15) where he seems incidentally to mention transactions which took place as late as the year 408 B.C. He must therefore still have been engaged in writing in that year, or rather in some still later year; for it is not likely that the transactions in question would be noticed by him in his work on

argument of Colonel Mure, p. 547. On the view which we have taken, there would be nothing to surprise us in the circumstance, that it may contain one or two promises of future narrative, which the historian never remembered to fulfil.

* Dahlmann's list appeared twice in English before his work was translated (Kenrick, p. xvi.; *Class. Mus.* i. 188). An independent list, containing some additions, was annexed by Mr. Long to his “Summary of Herodotus,” 1829, p. clxiii. Dahlmann enumerates twenty-two allusions, to which we are able to add twelve others, that deserve consideration (many of them have already received it from other writers); viz. iii. 119 (if borrowed from the Antigone, which was first represented in 440), iv. 148 (placed by Niebuhr between 428 and 416, *Philol. Mus.* i. 255), 163 (eighth reign of the Battidae did not begin till circ. 460-466), v. 77 (the Athenian Propylææ, not built till 436-431), vi. 91 (431, Thuc. ii. 27), 131 (mention of Pericles), vii. 139 (cf. Niebuhr, l. l. and Grote, v. 82), viii. 3 (Athenian ἀρχαί, 477), 56 (see Müller, *Sacr. Min. Pol.* p. 18), ix. 37 (Hegestratus), 64 (Acimnestus), and 165 (Hermolyceus at Carystus. Thuc. i. 98). We need not recapitulate those of Dahlmann, many of which are cited below.

† Niebuhr, l. l. and *Lectures on Anc. Hist.*, i. 820; Müller, *Lit.* p. 268; Grote, iv. 306, note; cf. v. 82, 87, &c.

the very year of their occurrence, and of its termination. It is therefore a fair further inference, that his life may have been prolonged some years beyond the date of the last events mentioned by him, and that he may consequently have seen the commencement of the fourth century B.C."—P. 245, *see also* Appendix G.

As we are thus brought back to the latest of the dates which had been given, to make ample room for which, Colonel Mure elsewhere discredits the common date for his birth, it becomes necessary to look more closely at the arguments on the only two passages which furnish ground for this conclusion.

1. What is the date of the revolt of the Medes from Darius, mentioned in i. 130? The reader of Herodotus is familiar with only one Darius, the renowned son of Hystaspes, who fills so much space in the historian's narrative. The revolt alluded to is mentioned in language that would naturally suggest an event long past. It is connected directly with the transactions which transferred the empire of the East from Astyages the Mede to Cyrus the Persian, in 559. *Afterwards* (ὕστερον χρόνῳ), Herodotus says, the Medes repented of their submission, and revolted from Darius, who conquered and subdued them. No one who was reading the passage without a commentator by his side to perplex him,* would ever doubt for a moment, that among the restless movements of the Eastern nations, when the strong hand of the great Darius was for the first time moulding their unwieldy mass into something like organic unity (after B.C. 521), there was a revolt of the Medians, which the historian thought this a very proper place to record. That such a revolt, in itself highly probable, did take place, appears from the Behistun inscription. Mr. Grote has ingeniously developed a more complete account of it, from the scattered hints furnished in connexion with the usurpation and fate of the Pseudo-Smerdis; but the argument stands clear of the truth or falsehood of his hypothesis. That the event not only might have happened, but *did* happen, will be sufficient, for any one who is familiar with the method of Herodotus, to outweigh any considerations based upon his supposed silence elsewhere.

It was, however, no other reason than that silence which led the old chronologers (followed here by Clinton, Dahlmann,

* We must except Mr. Blakesley. His short note is completely to the purpose : — "This expression has been supposed to refer to the revolt under Darius Nothus, which was put down in the year 408 B.C., and an argument relative to the time of Herodotus's writing his history has been deduced from it. But the sentence, if proceeding from the hand of the author, seems more likely to relate to the troubles which took place under the Pseudo-Smerdis, the Magian. See note on iii. 126 [not yet published]. It is apparently a mere memorandum, although there is no reason to dispute its genuineness."

Heyse, and Mure) to refer the allusion of Herodotus to that revolt of the Medes from Darius *Nothus*, which is recorded by Xenophon (Hell. i. 2, § 19), and which belongs to the year B.C. 409. It seems difficult to imagine a more improbable explanation than this:—that Herodotus, writing, at the nearest, within two or three years after an insurrection had happened in the distant East, should have hastened, against his more usual practice with contemporary events, to intrude a record of it into the heart of a narrative of what occurred a century and a half before; that he should mention it in language suited to an event of all but equal remoteness; that without a hint of the great intervening gulf of time, crowded with the events of his own whole history, and of many a stirring later year, he should connect the one event with the other, by a direct relation of motive,—the revolt springing from repentance for the submission, which thus bore fruit after a slow growth of a hundred and fifty years; and to complete the confusion, should expect his readers to find out by intuition, that the name *Darius*, which, throughout the rest of his history,* denotes a certain very celebrated king, in this single passage means a much obscurer sovereign, who mounted the throne more than sixty years after the Great Darius died. Colonel Mure's arguments do not meet these difficulties in any single point. First, he entangles the question, whether Herodotus alludes to *any* revolt of the Medes under Darius son of Hystaspes, with the very different question, whether Mr. Grote has succeeded in fixing the precise time and circumstances of that revolt; next, he treats Mr. Grote's hypothesis with some (of course unintentional) unfairness, by ignoring the evidence which he adduces, and by confounding what he says of a revolt which *followed the deposition* of Smerdis with his previous usurpation; having thus established, as he thinks, a "strange incongruity" in Mr. Grote's account, he proceeds to cast it back on that whole "interpretation of the passage," which, as we have seen, rests on grounds completely independent, involving no incongruity at all;† and lastly, he disposes of the actual testimony of the Behistun inscription with the remark, that "Herodotus shows no knowledge of those transactions," which in this passage is the very point in dispute; and which is not so certain as he assumes elsewhere.

2. The other proof of the lower date is drawn from iii. 15, where Herodotus quotes the cases of Thannyras, son of Inarus, and Pausiris, son of Amyrtæus, to illustrate his assertion, that the

* The mention of the young prince in ix. 108 can scarcely be considered an exception.

† See especially *Göller*, Vit. Thucyd., p. 47. It is quite unnecessary, however, to expunge either the passage in Herodotus or the passage in Xenophon. They refer to entirely distinct occasions. Mr. Kenrick's view (*Ant. Eg. ii. 498*) seems to resemble that of Mr. Grote. Compare *Quarterly Review*, lxxix. 431-2.

Persians honoured the sons of kings, and often restored to such persons power which their fathers had forfeited by rebellion. It is with the latter of these instances that we are concerned. The facts are briefly these. We know from Thucydides (i. 110, 112), that a leader of the name of Amyrtæus shared in the Egyptian revolt which was headed by the Lybian Inarus, in B.C. 460, and remained independent, in the marshes of the Delta, after that revolt had been quelled in 455, at least as late as 449. When he died, says the passage now before us, his son Pausiris succeeded him, (of course in that small separate government,) with the sanction of the Persians. But when *did* he die? If we had no evidence but such as these two historians furnish, we should take it for granted that it was not long after the latest mention of him in 449.* The whole cast of the passage in Herodotus implies this. Amyrtæus and Inarus are connected in the injuries which they inflicted on the Persians;—none, says Herodotus, did more injury to the Persians than they;—they are connected in the good returns that the sons of both received; and we should naturally infer that the succession of the son of Amyrtæus was part of the same series of events with, though a few years later than, the succession of the son of Inarus, which fell either in or soon after 455.

But the question is embarrassed by the appearance of this same name Amyrtæus at a much later period, as the sole king of the 28th dynasty of Manetho.† This person reigned six years, the commencement of which period is differently fixed by different chronologers in 419, 414, 405, and 404. The second of these years, which is the date commonly chosen, would place the death of Amyrtæus in 408; and if he were the same Amyrtæus whose previous history we have been tracing, that would be the year in which the event occurred which Herodotus records. Now, that this is perfectly *possible*, must of course be granted. We see nothing to complain of in Colonel Mure's picture of the "patriot Egyptian prince," unsuccessful "say at the age of 25," but "as the result of a more successful struggle," "hailed as monarch by his fellow-countrymen even at the advanced age of 73,"—"the hardy old veteran," victorious at last "against the alien dynasty;"—nothing at least but an entire want of evidence to prove the identity between the two. But

* So Mr. Keurick puts it: "Amyrtæus [after 449] made submission to the Persians, [is this one point certain!] and his son Pausiris was allowed to succeed to his father's power."—*Ancient Egypt*, ii. 436.

† See the lists in C. Muller, *Fragm. Hist. Gr.*, ii. 596, *cf.* p. 605, and Buensen's *Egypt*, i. 642, ed. Cottrell. Colonel Mure mentions in a note, that M. Buensen's opinion on the passage in Herodotus "coincides in all material points with" his own. On the other side, see *Güter*, *Vit. Thuc.* p. 48; *Keurick*, *Egypt of Hdt.*, p. 238, and especially *Ancient Egypt*, ii. 489, 492, 494; *Arnold*, *addit. notes* to second ed. of *Thucyd.*, p. 21, *Böckh*, as quoted by C. Muller, i. 1, and Mr. Grote, iv. 306. For the older chronologers, see *Clinton*, *F. H. R.* 317 u

we do not think that Colonel Mure states correctly the point where the strain of the argument must fall. No one doubts that an Amyrtæus was "a very remarkable personage" in 460-449. His position is so far clearly ascertained from Herodotus and Thucydides. No one doubts, again, that the Amyrtæus of Manetho, the Saïte king of the 28th dynasty, was "a very remarkable personage" about 414-408. The monuments combine with the different copyists of Manetho to prove it. The only unproved point is, the identity between the one and the other; some notice, in some of these authorities, of the actual fact of this resuscitation. But we can find no such thing. Herodotus and Thucydides seem to speak only of the one, Manetho only of the other. We cannot perceive one link to connect them but the identity of a name, which was so far from being a rare one, that it had appeared at least *twice* previously in the earlier Egyptian History.* If Herodotus had known of this long retirement and ultimate return, he would never have omitted to complete the parallel between Amyrtæus and the blind old king, who built an island of ashes in these same marshes many centuries before, which Amyrtæus was the first to find (ii. 140). He would never have connected them for the mere *place* of their retirement, and left out the far more striking analogy of their resemblance in patient endurance, and in their ultimate reward. Besides, as Dr. Arnold pointed out with his usual clearness, the cases of the two men do not tally. There is no Pausiris in Manetho to follow his Amyrtæus. There *could* be none, as a "mere satrap of the Persian emperor," even if, as Col. Mure suggests, the pride of the native annalist forebore to name him; for Egypt continued in a state of revolt long after the death of that Amyrtæus in 408. On the other hand, in 449, the holding of the other Amyrtæus in the marshes was the only part of Egypt not subject to Persia, and would be likely enough to fall to them when its defender died. Over that portion of the country,—not as Colonel Mure puts it, over the whole "government of Egypt,"—would Pausiris be made the "vassal-king." On the whole, instead of agreeing with Colonel Mure, that Mr. Grote has preferred a "hackneyed expedient" in assuming two Amyrtæi, we are more disposed to agree with Dr. Arnold, that nothing short of a "strange confusion" could roll together the two into one.† *Four* Amyrtæi, then, appear in

* See it first in Eratosthenes (Myrtæus), where it answers to Manetho's 7th dynasty (C. Muller, *Fragm., &c.*, ii. 559, 612; Bunsen, i. 672, who says, "Unde et Amyrtæus in seriori Egyptiorum historia"); secondly in Ctesias, as the name of the king conquered by Cambyses, whom Herodotus calls Psammenitus. *Ctes.* ed. Muller, p. 47. It has been proposed to introduce the name also into Ctesias's account of the revolt of Inarus, by reading *Amyrtæus* for *Isigou*, p. 52, Muller.

† There are some other expressions in Colonel Mure's argument to which we might take exception, e.g., "Herodotus tells us that no man ever inflicted greater evils on the Persians than his Amyrtæus." Now, Herodotus says, "than *Inarus*

Egyptian history:—first, that ancient king recorded by Herodotus; secondly, the one named by Ctesias, in his narrative of the conquest of Cambyses; thirdly, the companion of Inarus, who was also the father of Pausiris; and fourthly, the king of Manetho's twenty-eighth dynasty, whose green breccia sarcophagus, now in the British Museum, is doubtless a familiar object to many of our readers. This fourth may, for anything we know to the contrary, be the grandson of the third, and the son of Pausiris, as some of the scholars quoted in our notes determine; but our argument stands clear of any such hypothetical element.

We have dwelt the longer on these two passages, because it is confessed that, if they fail, the later date assigned for the writing of the history must be given up; there are no other texts alleged in the controversy that would bear the weight of such a theory. On the other hand, there are a few passages that may be used for an opposite purpose, namely, to fix a date at which Herodotus could *not* be still employed in writing. Such are these, that he could scarcely have spoken as he does (vi. 98) of the troubles which befell the Greeks, from internal as well as external war, during the reigns of Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes, if he had continued to write far into the reign of Darius Nothus; that he could scarcely have called the slaughter sustained by the Tarentines and Rhegians in their attack on the Messapians (vii. 170), the greatest which he knew of among Greeks, if he had survived the Athenian disaster in Sicily in 413; and that he could not have described the Spartans as sparing the Athenian Decelea (ix. 73), if he had known of their occupation of it in that same year. To these three passages, Mr. Grote adds two more; one which seems very precarious, that the account which Demaratus gives of the Spartans in vii. 104 would have assumed a different form in the mind of the historian, after the capture of the Spartans in Sphacteria in 425; the other, a more weighty passage, that the expulsion of the Æginetæ from their island in 431, (Thuc. ii. 27,) would not have seemed to Herodotus so complete an execution of the

and Amyrteus,"—a difference which becomes of some consequence when we read on.—"Nor indeed can the strong language used by Herodotus to characterise the Anti-Persian influence of his Amyrteus, be considered as justified merely by his performances in the first part of his career," &c. Why not, if they were connected with those of Inarus, whose career was confessedly shorter than his own? Agassiz: "Of such a duplicate Amyrteus there is no trace in the allusions of either Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus, or other authors who treat of the history of this time." How could there be any such trace in any of the authors named? So far as we can recollect, Diodorus never mentions Amyrteus at all, either duplicate or single, (See xl. 71, 74, 75, 77, xii. 3, 4, xiii. 46, lvi. xlv. 35;) Thucydides certainly never mentions the one of 414, though his history sweeps past that time; and we do not know that Herodotus even lived to hear of that Amyrteus, except from this disputed passage.

Divine wrath against them, (vi. 91,) as the sadder fate which they experienced from the Athenians in 424 (Thuc. iv. 57).^{*} But, considering the probable distance of the historian from Greece, and our scanty acquaintance with his methods of addition and revisal, we can scarcely admit that these passages bind him down to the earliest years of the Peloponnesian war. Some passages, on the contrary, imply a longer acquaintance with its incidents.[†] Upon the whole, therefore, the conclusion of Müller seems to us the safest and the best,—that he was writing on between 431 and 421, but not, so far as the evidence proves, beyond the latter year; from which it follows, that there is no ground at all for believing that too early a date has been commonly fixed for his birth.

A very few words more will suffice for the chronology of his life. The evidence on this head, as we have observed before, is scantier still. There are scarcely more than *two* passages which furnish anything like a personal date; one which proves that he was in Egypt, *at least once*, some time after 460, or perhaps we should say 455;† the other, that he was in Athens, *at least once*, after 431, or at the earliest, 436.§ To these we may add, that he is

* See especially Grote, iv. 307, v. 61. Of these five passages, Colonel Mure alludes to none but the first, which he proposes to set aside by the consideration, that in Herodotus's "spirit of methodical subtlety," "three generations of calamity would abundantly suffice for one prodigy." We are not convinced by this argument; and besides, the other passages remain untouched. The argument from Hellanicus can scarcely be admitted when we have so much better materials at hand. Dahlmann's treatment of the passages vi. 98, and ix. 73, is curious. He uses the first only to prove that Herodotus wrote after the death of Artaxerxes in 425, (perhaps so, yet not long after;) and he looks upon the second as in actual allusion to the events of 413 (Thuc. vii. 19). On this latter passage, we have not advanced upon the view of Wesseling; "Aliud profecto *ἄρχωντος Δαρείου, ἐπ' αὐτῶν τινερ, aliud occupatarum munimentis et presidio instructe, bellique sedem legere. Contigisse res videtur, quæ et Ampl. Bouhours, opinio, belli l'el quando Archidamus Atticam incursionibus infestam habuit, principio, Thuc. i. 10." So also, still more definitely, Müller; the passage "cannot be reconciled with the siege of Decælea by Agis in 413." Similarly Thirlwall, speaking of that event, says, that the Spartans "in their previous invasions had spared the lands of Decælea," &c., iii. 428. Dahlmann allows that vii. 170 was probably written before 413.*

† To the first two years belong the passages iv. 80 (mention of Sitalces, vi. 91, vii. 137, and vii. 283. Without debating the dates of iii. 160, iv. 148, or vii. 114, we should conclude that vi. 98, and some expressions in ix. 73, imply a knowledge extending beyond 430. This view of the date of vi. 98, makes it unlikely that Thucydides was acquainted with it, as we have suggested before.

† See iii. 12, where he mentions that he saw the bones of those who died at the battle of Pappemle, 480. He speaks of them in connexion with those of the dead who were slain in the time of Cambyse. In ii. 89, he speaks of the Persians as again in power, &c., after 485, cf. Kenrick, *Ann. Eg.* ii. 70. Still it is possible that he "visited Egypt during its temporary occupation by the Greeks," as well as either before or afterwards.

See v. 77. Cf. *Jager*, p. 29. Mr. Kenrick remarks, on the wording of this passage, that Herodotus does not seem to have been living "actually in Greece, at least in Athens, when the history received its present form," p. xiv. So also Donaldson, p. 166.

also said to have recited at Athens in 446 (some say much later);* that some communication existed, as we have seen, between him and Sophocles in 440, in which year Sophocles was one of the generals at Samos; and that the Thurian Colony, to which he ultimately belonged, went out in 443, but it is not known whether he joined it then or at some later time. Now, in the case of a more stationary person, these few hints might perhaps be linked together into something like a chain of dates. But we cannot make such a use of them in this case, without placing a fetter on the historian's free and rapid movements, which he of all men would least submit to bear. We do not know on what resources or in what character he travelled. We only know that he sometimes speaks of complicated journeys for special purposes (*e. g.* ii. 44); and sometimes, like the flying Englishman, with whom Dahlmann compares him, he may have been in Ionia, Egypt, Athens, and Italy all in the course of a single year. With regard, then, to such a narrative as that of Dr. Donaldson,—that Herodotus was a Persian subject from 484 to 452; “a distinguished foreigner settled at Samos” from 452 to about 431; and “for the rest of his life an Athenian μέτοικος, living chiefly as an Athenian colonist at Thurii, and engaged in systematizing and harmonizing into one great whole the historical narratives and traveller's tales by which he had gained his great reputation,”†—we can only say that, if it contains little which anybody can contradict, it also contains much which nobody can prove. We may admire the dexterity with which the few established facts are embroidered on the bald narrative of Suidas; but in spirit, it is a return to the principle of the old biographies, differing only in the higher skill and scholarship with which it is applied.

The general result of our inquiry is, that we can find no reason for disturbing the date of the historian's birth, any more than for doubting that statement of his “period,” which extends it from the Persian to the Peloponnesian war; that Lucian's story, though it may be in itself a mere romance, is in keeping with what we know from other sources of the mode in which the works of Herodotus were first made public, as well as with the obvious characteristics of his method; that even if his writings did not win the instant popularity which Lucian's tale had taught us to look for, they were certainly better known to his contemporaries than we could have inferred from the general silence, or from the disparaging allusion in Otesias; known to some who, like Aristotle, could admire and sympathise,—to others who, like

* See the Dissertation of C. F. Hermann in Bähr, which we cited before.

† Dr. Donaldson takes no notice (so far as we see) of Dahlmann's labours; and still quotes undoubtingly the Olympic recitation (*p.* 166). Dahlmann's readers will object both to that and to the above expression.

Thucydides, had a stricter theory of investigation which led them to depreciate; and that the few remaining facts and dates which bear upon his personal history can only aid us in filling up the portrait of *the man*, and will not yield any exact or well established narrative of the successive events of his life. There are still two subjects on which we shall offer a few remarks before we close this article—the principles of historical composition on which Herodotus really proceeded, and the true character of the “superstition” or “credulity” which has been so strongly condemned in his writings.

As to the first of these points, Herodotus has received some prejudice from the effects of his own sounding titles, the “Father of History,” *Ἰάδος ἀρχαίης ιστορίας πρύτανης*, and the like. Coupled with some of his own expressions, they have caused him to be tried under a wrong character, and to be condemned by inapplicable laws. If in point of time he is the first Historian, in point of praise he is the Prince of Chroniclers—of all Greek Logographers, not so much the latest, as the best. To judge him fairly, then, his work must be classed under more than one head of literature, and tested by more than one rule. To say, as some, that when considered as a history it is found wanting—that the indulgence which we might concede to the author is not to be extended to his work*—is to state only half, or less than half, the truth. The greater portion of the book is *not* history, in the strictest sense; at best it only furnishes *materials* for history; and it is only his merit as an artist, and the skill with which he works up those materials into a whole of independent and inestimable worth, which forbids us to compare him to voyagers who might build ships with precious timber in some distant land, for others to break up and use in more enduring structures, when they have brought their treasure safely home.

Whether he have *any* merit under the head of History, we shall leave it for Mr. Grote to answer.† But we must ourselves insist upon the value of Logography *for its own sake*, as distinct from History. Let us suppose two travellers, neither of them competent to divine correctly the meaning of an old inscription, which they have found graven in forgotten letters on some remote and almost inaccessible rock; can we doubt which of them will render best service to the scholar at home, the one who, without the requisite qualifications, guesses at the meaning, and

* Compare Colonel Mure, p. 295, pp. 409-10, &c. &c.

† See for example, Grote, i 525, 539 & ii. 77; iv. 426; v. 7, 16, &c. On Herodotus as an authority for the Persian war, cf. iv. 465, 472; v. 24, 46, &c. On his religion, cf. v. 15, 16, note. and 33, note. Compare too, the qualifying remarks in iv. 300-301; v. 39, &c. Considering how little Mr. Grote can really sympathise with some of those peculiarities in Herodotus which others have called weakness, we cannot but express our profound admiration for the manly and generous criticism which Herodotus receives at his hands.

presents us with the imaginary product: or the other, who, taking a juster estimate of his own powers and duties, brings home an exact fac-simile of every line and mark that can be traced upon the precipice, and submits it as it stands to sounder criticism?*

There is one difference that must be marked before we apply this parallel to Herodotus, namely, that his copy has a distinct artistic value, independently of this its subordinate worth. He lived in days when the materials even of a polished mirror must be precious. If then, on this score, he has only the secondary praise which falls to a reporter, he has primary praise under another head. With that explanation, the analogy holds good. If it were only as a record of contemporary opinion, as it prevailed among the masses who ranked lower than such men as "Pericles and Anaxagoras, Thucydides and Aristophanes," (Mure, p. 353), his work would be priceless in the eyes of all,* who wish to understand what concerned the common ranks, as well as the great giants of antiquity. Let us ask the simple question, knowing precisely the sort of mind and the amount of critical skill which he really possessed, how much, that bears on the general mental attitude of that important era, we should have lost for ever, if, instead of taking us into partnership, so to speak, by sharing all his materials with us, he had tried to do our work completely for us—had himself attempted, in all those countless λόγοι, to enunciate the historic truth which might lie hid in every tale, and had then deprived us of the rest? We see that Thucydides seldom tries to analyze the earlier stories without failing. But we cannot blame him. They belonged to Logography, and Logography was not his calling. The only fault which he committed was, to leave at all the province of contemporary history, in which even yet he reigns an unrivalled master, for the purpose of meddling with materials which could not be dealt with by anything higher than Logography. Herodotus also had a theory of criticism, but it was like a hankering after weapons which he could not use. In his case, then, it was a happy inconsistency, which so often seduced him into the pleasant paths of Logography, and made him forget his creed of stricter history.

But, it may be objected, is he really a good reporter? Is he not too illogical, too fanciful, too much warped by prejudice, too much blinded by superstition; to give us even reports that we

* Compare Mr. Kenrick's remark about Hecataeus: "He might with more propriety begin his work with a declaration, that he wrote as seemed to him to be true, the fables of the Greeks being many and ridiculous. He appears to have corrected these fables, however, to his own notions of credibility, in the superficial method in which he has since had so many followers, lowering the *speciosa miraacula* of an essentially poetical fable, to a prosaic statement more false than the fable itself." P. vii.

can trust? So some have suggested. In reply we urge, *first*, that no one at any rate doubts his absolute *truthfulness*,* and that is something. It is proved abundantly. Sometimes he reports things which he *could* not have understood, such as the fact which surprised him, that Neco's Phœnician sailors found the sun on their right hand in the course of their voyage round Africa (iv. 42); and at other times, things which he plainly *did* not understand, such as the punning threat of Croesus, based upon the ancient name of Lampsacus (vi. 37), and perhaps the Argive oracle which, as others thought, received its true explanation from the legend of the bravery of Telesilla (vi. 77).† This, we repeat, is something, though of course not all. *Next*, as no reporter can take down mere flying rumours with precisely the same literal accuracy with which (to qualify further our former analogy) he might copy the inscription on the rock, it is always necessary, when dealing with such reports, to allow for the characteristics and principles of the person to whom we are indebted for them. In the case of Herodotus, his perfect simplicity places the whole man so distinctly before us, that we can have no difficulty in discovering what allowances of this sort are needed.

It will be seen that we are not concerned to deny the charge itself. It is true, though not to the extent which some have stated, that while we are reading his writings we are forced to see things *with his eyes*, that is, under the precise aspect, moral, religious,

* Even in what has been charged against him as "a spirit of exaggeration" or "hyperbole," Colonel Mure (p. 399) is willing to allow that there was no "wilful falsification." But on some of the instances of this fault which are alleged by Colonel Mure, he could be more directly defended. Let us take one from the account of the expedition of Xerxes:—"Even poetical agency," says Colonel Mure, "is called in to add to the general effect. The army on its march through Thrace is assailed by lions (vii. 125), an animal never assuredly indigenous in that region, and the creatures alluded to, if not altogether fictitious, may safely be classed as some species of mountain lynx or wild cat, which the legend had magnified into lions for the occasion" (p. 402). It is not said that the lions attacked "the army," but only *the camels*, and that by night. But to let that pass; surely Colonel Mure's contradiction is far too peremptory. The deliberate statement of Herodotus (126) on the precise limits within which lions were then seen in Europe, is corroborated by the equally clear assertions of Aristotle (H. A. p. 579, b., and p. 606, b., ed. Berol.), who is followed by Pliny (H. N. viii. 17, fin.), and of Pausanias (vi. 5, sect. 3); it is incidentally confirmed by the mere existence of such legends as that of the Nemean lion and the maid Cyrene, implying the belief in a still wider European extension of the animal in earlier times: it is supported by monuments; by the perfect familiarity which the oldest Greek poets shew with the lion's habits and nature; and especially by the coins of Acanthus, on the route where Xerxes passed, which bear a lion springing on a bull. We are also told by zoologists, that the lion must have formerly existed in many parts of the world which it has now completely abandoned; and that there is no reason why it may not at one time have been found on the European side of the Black Sea. If these considerations are not sufficient to establish the probability of Herodotus's statement, they should at all events protect it from so unqualified a condemnation.

† Compare Thirlwall, ii. 263, with Müller, Dor. i. 197; Grote, iv. 433.

dramatic, or poetical, in which they presented themselves to his own mind or fancy as he wrote. This is indeed a necessary condition of a disposition so open, combined with a character so strongly individualized. If he resembles Homer in the clearness of the stream of narrative,—the exquisite accuracy with which it reflects all images that fall athwart its bosom, there is yet this difference, that the water, though clear, is not so colourless, and that the impressions, though correct in form, receive some tinges from the foreign hues, which the medium of reflexion imparts. What we are rather disposed to dispute is the conclusion, that we are really exposed, by so transparent a peculiarity, to any deception which would make his reports less practically useful. We may apply to him what has been said of a far humbler chronicler:—We have “no wish to deny that which is apparent of itself to every reader, the peculiar fascination, if one may call it so, by which [Herodotus] was led unconsciously to communicate more or less of his own tone and character to all whom he undertook to represent. But this is like his custom of putting long speeches into their mouths: we see at once that it is his way, and *it deceives no one.*”

Thirdly, We are now in a position to form a fair estimate of the chief sources from which he drew his narratives, and therefore to make the necessary allowances on that ground also. We can see, for instance, how often Hellenic views have influenced his stories of Oriental incident, as clearly as critics have always seen, how often the local pride of his informants has given birth to what he received as genuine Egyptian history. We know

* By Mr. Keble, of honest Izaak Walton. The chief of the *colouring* influences in Herodotus were unquestionably of a moral and religious character. See Mr. Grote's remarks on the analysis of Hoffmeister, v. 15. We may add a logical error,—the disposition to generalize so strongly, as not unfrequently to present mere inferences almost in the form of facts; a remark which applies especially to his geographical and physical theories, *e.g.*, to his comparison between the Nile and Danube, or such passages as iii. 104. In other instances, his dramatic turn plainly led him to ascribe to his speakers what they *might* have said, when he could possess no knowledge whatever of what they really *did* say. Perhaps there are some cases in which individuals are thus credited with gnomic sayings, which were really the common property of the whole nation. We will not say that the language which he puts into the mouth of Solon (l. 32) is of this description; even Aristotle quotes it under Solon's name (*Eth. Nicom.* i. 10); but a comparison of the closing words of *Hdt.* i. 5, at any rate proves that Herodotus himself contributed the form, in which the old saying of Solon is embodied. We may add that the use of *commonplaces* did not offend his sense of historical precision. Such is the very curious series set forth by Colonel Mure, pp. 406-408; in l. 155, *lil.* 124, v. 73, and v. 105. Another series is the commonplace of appealing to the poverty or wealth of countries or their inhabitants, as a check or incitement to ambition. See i. 71 (the poverty of the Persians before their conquest of Lydia, consistent with ix. 122, but at variance with what is said of the Medes, in i. 128, and with i. 207); and v. 49 (the riches of the East contrasted with the poverty of Greece; consistent with vii. 102, but not with vii. 5). But in all these peculiarities, there is really nothing which an intelligent reader would not at once observe and allow for.

that we must regard his writings as the legacy of one, who had roamed over many lands in gathering those multifarious stores, provided, as it seems, with no language but his native tongue, with no previous experiences to guard him against error, with no clear canons of criticism to discriminate between legend and history, between the local tale that had grown up to account for some strange name or monument, and the true tradition which treasured up the memories of the past. But in all these cases, we must simply adjust our statements by our fuller knowledge. We must regard him as a good reporter, not of certain histories, but of the views which certain classes of men, with whom he came in contact, had been led, by one cause or another, to form of history. The report, as a record of contemporary opinion, has only changed its relation, not lost its value. That in some few cases we could have spared the detail of palpable impostures which were practised upon him, does not detract from the general worth of so large a body of contemporary evidence, drawn up by so highly gifted a reporter, on almost all branches of earlier belief, as well as on the widespread effects of recent change.

Again, there is another consideration, which, while it implies an acknowledgment of his imperfections, furnishes at once an explanation of their existence and a disproof of their prejudicial influence, namely, the recollection that we have gained a far more complete command even over his own materials than it was ever possible for him to exercise. This is partly due to the mere length of time for which we have had them in hand; the closer scrutiny to which we can subject them; the vast mass of illustration, from monuments, as well as from parallel narratives in other ancient writers, which has been accumulated round them, sometimes, as in the marked case of the rock sculpture near Nymphi,* from the discovery and more minute examination of the very figures which he himself described; but especially from the establishment of a system of chronology, which enables us to fix and define what he found wholly unsettled and uncertain. This must indeed have been one of his main difficulties; the entire absence of definite landmarks, such as have long ere now been planted all along the main highways of history. To Herodotus the whole ground on which he had to build was shifting; or, to change the metaphor, we may say that he resembled a shipwrecked sailor who has to construct his raft, while he and all his timbers with him are floating together on the wave. The same remark might be applied with still more effect to his deficiencies in geographical science. But we must pause,

* See Classical Museum, i. 82, 231-236.

with this additional remark, that though some of his contemporaries knew some things far better than he did,—though others, like Thucydides, possessed a totally different kind of historical faculty, yet these circumstances are no bar to his especial praise on his own peculiar ground. Thucydides, for instance, could reflect and analyze where Herodotus could only inquire and record. But let each man be satisfied to be what God made him, and to do the work for which he seems to have been designed, without complaining because he was not cast in a different mould, with power to do some different work.

Finally : In Herodotus, beyond most authors, it is essential, as we have already suggested, to distinguish between the matter and the form. The form of his writings is his own. The materials were as diversified as the scenes he passed through in his wandering life. To comprehend their true nature and relations, we must divest ourselves of every notion suggested by the clearer view which modern knowledge gives the traveller, as well as the greater critical and revising care which modern literary habits exact from the writer. Deducting what we will for the causes which have been enumerated, there will remain, even in his material, all the value we have claimed for it : it is still a mass of contemporary opinion, to which all antiquity can furnish no complete parallel. But on the other side he commands far nobler commendation. Standing earliest, though far from greatest, in the line of real historians, the first, apparently, to combine grace of style and skill in composition with the more solid purposes of prose narration, that skill and that grace form the foundation of his highest praise. Over the materials of his narrative, he has exercised, as we allow, a feebler influence. It is not often given to one man to work out a double reformation. It is praise enough that he achieved the one improvement, and foresaw the distant promise of the other : that he first clothed the muse of history in a garb of graceful beauty, and anticipated, though very faintly and imperfectly, the scrutiny to which maturer criticism would subject the elements of historic truth.

We must take a similar view of the other point we mentioned,—the “credulity” and “superstition” of Herodotus. It is not sufficient to say, on one side, that Herodotus must be excused because he was a Heathen ; nor, on the other side, that he must be condemned because many Heathens were less credulous. We must draw clearer distinctions than this before we try him. No doubt many then, as many now, shook off the weight of any faith in powers higher than the laws of nature ; some, like the “*Graius homo*” of Lucretius, fronting the dread face of superstition with a firm defiance ; others simply closing their eyes against all evidence of an unseen world, and forcing all their thoughts into the common grooves of human life. In so far as Herodotus

differed from these, he was nearer the truth than they were, though he made mistakes from which they were protected by the obvious principle, that if a man seeks *no* signs of God's presence at all, he will at any rate be sure to find no *wrong* signs. A similar division might obviously be made among ourselves, on such a doctrine, for instance, as that of special Providence, which some repudiate, some ignore, and some believe. Now, such a Heathen as Herodotus may fairly claim to be compared with the third of these classes, rather than with the first or second. Much of what the wisest who believe that doctrine would assert, might seem folly to those who deny it, and superstition to those who neglect it. We can imagine, for instance, that very different accounts of a visitation of pestilence would be given by a "Positive" Philosopher, by a mere Statesman, and by a Christian Philosopher, such as (to mention only one name) the late Dr. Chalmers.* And the Positive Philosopher would be perplexed, unless he explained it as a professional peculiarity, to know why so intelligent a Divine should shew so much anxiety to keep clear and bright the doctrines of God's present agency, behind the apparently untroubled screen of natural sequence.

Now let the question be disembarassed of any appeal to views of the unseen world which Herodotus (and a great many Christians with him) would reject on principle; and we shall find it easy to specify the exact nature and mischief of his errors. A heathen who was deeply impressed with the belief in higher powers, and their present agency, would plainly be most perplexed by these two wants: the want of any authenticated teaching on the nature of the Creator, and the want of any scientific exposition of the laws which he has impressed upon creation. To such an one, two voices in which God speaks to us were silent: the voice of written revelation, and the voice in which he permits advancing science to propound some explanations of the method of his work. Of the Creator, that heathen could know but little more than that "we are also his offspring,"—a truth which he often read in inverted characters, when he reasoned back from man to God. Of science he knew too little to have any just conception of the true march of natural sequence—any just views on the precise character of that uniformity which pervades the ordinances of heaven and earth. Still less, then, could he form any clear notion of the mode in which Providence works harmoniously with Law, in the moral government under which we live.

This account does not pledge us to any one of the special instances by which Herodotus manifests his belief in that moral go-

* We refer particularly to his Discourse "on the consistency between the efficacy of Prayer and the uniformity of Nature."

vernment. All that we say is, they are the imperfect expressions of profound eternal truth. We cannot acknowledge the completeness or even the fairness of any account of them, which fails to draw out this distinction in the strongest and the broadest form. For one thing is peculiarly manifest throughout the writings of Herodotus. The wonders which he recounts are all treated as signs of this great principle, the sovereignty of some superior power, be it Fate or Deity or God. They are not fragments of a wretched fetish-worship, or marks of any groveling confusion between the Creator and the meanest of his works. The fundamental belief is, that something divine is always present among men, and that marvels are the signs of its presence: that there is some close connexion between sin and sorrow: that vengeance belongs more truly to God than to man: that arrogance is a direct offence against heaven: that God can make known his will, through some miraculous agency, to his creatures upon earth. But that Herodotus, having no authentic declaration of God's ways, should constantly mistake the signs of his appearances, seems a necessary result of the conditions of the case;—on the one side, his reverential mind, and longing after clearer knowledge: on the other side, his real ignorance, both of written revelation and of scientific laws. Hence springs all that timidity and confusion which he often manifests about the gods and heroes: the wavering between a brighter and a vaguer faith: the belief that the human ministers of oracles might lie for lucre (v. 63; vi. 66), while yet high above them rose the prophetic power, which was sometimes manifested in stern decisions upon moral laws (i. 159; vi. 86); the conception of God's vengeance on the haughty under a form like that which jealousy assumes in human rulers; and even the concession, which seems strangest of all, that human fancy may have had some influence in fashioning the common creed about the gods (ii. 53). To this cause also must be ascribed the greater portion of that credulity, on matters of religion, which so often believed amiss, because it possessed no certain rule which would enable it to believe aright.

Here we must leave the subject: gladly acknowledging that much has been already done to clear the position of the "Romantic Poet-Sage of History," and looking forward with hope to find still more accomplished in such promised works, as the *Translation and Annotations* which were long since announced by Mr. Rawlinson; and the completion of Mr. Blakesley's *Commentary*, which, we are told, will be ready for the public by the time when these remarks will reach them.

- ART. VI.—1. *Die Verhandlungen der Wittenberger Versammlung für Gründung eines Deutschen evangelischen Kirchenbundes.* Berlin, 1848
2. *Die Verhandlungen des 2ten Wittenberger Kirchentages.* Berlin, 1849.
3. *Die Verhandlungen des 3ten bis 6ten Kirchentages.* Berlin, 1850-1853.
4. *Lehrbuch des Katholischen und Evangelischen Kirchenrechts.* Von DR. ÆMILIUS LUDWIG RICHTER. 4te Auflage. Tauchnitz. Leipzig, 1853.
5. *Urkundenbuch der Evangelischen Union.* Von DR. CARL IMMANUEL NITZSCH. Bonn, 1853.
6. *Für Beibehaltung der Apochryphen.* Aus der Evangelischen Kirchenzeitung. Berlin, 1853.
7. *Die Apochryphen.* Von DR. RUDOLPH STIER. Braunschweig, 1853.

A SAYING ascribed to Cardinal Wiseman has given much satisfaction to German, and especially Prussian divines and orators, to the effect that the last contest with Protestantism must be waged upon the sand of the Mark of Brandenburg. An English traveller suddenly exchanging his own despised, and, it would seem, half-conquered country for this Thermopylæ of the universe, is apt to wonder both at the fear of Rome and the confidence of Berlin echoed and re-echoed in this saying. The metropolis of Prussia, it is true, is the capital of German philosophy and theology, and is probably also the capital of German radicalism, which would both give cardinals and legates some trouble to subdue. Its university, its pulpit, and its press, it may be admitted, with some unhappy exceptions, are more anti-papal than thirty years ago, and more true to the traditional position of the Brandenburg House and people. But so far as the pith and substance of a stout and successful resistance to Popery, or any other formidable invader, is guaranteed by the diffusion of earnest and intelligent religious conviction among the masses of its population, no city of Protestantism will be found so wanting. The Protestant army there has its officers, high and low, gathered more numerous perhaps than before around the banners of the Reformation, because around the banners of positive Christianity, but its rank and file have long ago deserted and are not yet recalled. A more discouraging impression is probably not made anywhere in Protestant Europe than by a Sunday spent in the Prussian capital. When the world has had its due in the ever-shifting formalism

of philosophy, (now for the time in abeyance,) in the prevailing heathenism of art, obtruded on squares, bridges, and frescoed museums, and in the barbarism of frequent reviews and military spectacles, to say nothing of the eagerness of business or dissipation, the day of rest comes round for the Church, to change the scene to a Christian spectator only for the worse. Places of business, indeed, have recently been closed by an unpopular edict, and public works suspended. In a few churches, and those among the largest, a crowd gathers in the morning to hear a distinguished preacher, but his colleague in the afternoon—perhaps equally faithful—addresses a handful of aged women. The middle-classes, to a vast extent alienated from Christianity, are engaged in feasting, travelling, or preparing for the evening theatre, which announces its choicest entertainments everywhere, even on the walls of the royal palace. The lower orders are strolling in pleasure-gardens, or rushing by cheap trains to the country, confuting every year, by increasing consumption of brandy, the nostrums of theorists at home who preach up the railway as the safety-valve for intemperance. And the young of both sexes are hastening to hardly disguised ruin, prepared for them in concert-rooms and dancing-saloons, and swelling that tide of illegitimacy which amounts to at least every fifth birth in the population. Hardly an evening service in any church exists to counteract this frightful evil, though a slight beginning has lately been made; and hence vast multitudes are hardly ever in a place of worship except when baptized or confirmed. The want of will is, however, sadder than the want of power; and notwithstanding the influence of the Court, to which is now added that of the University, and the attraction of zealous preachers, most of them respectable in point of eloquence, and one or two admirable, not more than five per cent. of the inhabitants, or 20,000 in 400,000, are regularly found in any Christian sanctuary. The pulpits, it must be owned, are for the most part free of error; the old rationalism hardly lingering at all, and the echo of Schleiermacher, once so vociferous, rapidly dying away. As M. Bethmann Hollweg remarked in his late opening speech at the meeting of the Kirchentag in Berlin, that gospel which he heard there for the first time forty years ago, as a secret whispered in the ear, is now preached on the house-tops. But what avail as yet the numerous voices crying as in the wilderness? Neither the Pharisees nor Sadducees are inclined to repentance. The stamp of godlessness is deeply fixed on this metropolis of Protestant Germany; and its recent revolutionary history, as well as moral statistics, which are better hinted at than published, too clearly prove that if Protestantism has no better bulwark than on the

"sand of the Mark," it is in more senses than one resting on the sand.

It would be unfair to Berlin to darken it in comparison with other great cities in Germany; unfair, perhaps, to Protestant Germany to take its great cities as a type of its religious character. But as the statistics of these are best known, a few similar details may be added, it being at the same time remembered that in the rural districts and smaller towns matters are here and there decidedly more favourable. In Stuttgart, then—the capital of south German Protestantism,—though in many country parishes of Württemberg a lively piety flourishes, and domestic worship is maintained even three times a-day,—the majority of shops are open on the day of rest, the theatre is crowded, while the churches are partially filled, and the mass of the numerous officers of state, (as is unhappily all but universal in the third and fourth rate capitals of Germany,) are hardened by rationalism against religion. In Elberfeld—the centre of Rhenish-Westphalian piety and missionary zeal—a great concert was got up two years ago, on the Sunday evening after the meeting of the Kirchentag and Inner Mission—as it were in the face of assembled Christianity. In Bremen a petition was signed, two or three years ago, by upwards of 10,000 persons, of whom one-half were females, in favour of a preacher named Dulon, who had scandalized all Germany, not only by his rationalism, but his red-republicanism—and openly declared from the pulpit, on Christmas, that the gospel of the day was a fable. In Hanover, a similar demonstration was made, last year, in favour of Steinecker—an adherent of the oldest rationalism, and an associate of the Friends of Light, though, perhaps, his popularity was increased by his having incurred the displeasure of the Austrian authorities, who dismissed him from Trieste. In Hamburg it is notorious that a few hundreds scattered over its immense churches, count for a large congregation. So hostile are its senate to the Inner Mission, that they have lately withdrawn the only church in which evening service had been commenced for the rescue of its teeming heathenism; and so far as we know, the free efforts of the Lutheran body, in that great and wealthy city, have not been able to supply a temporary place of worship. In Dresden a gospel sermon is rarely to be heard, and the kingdom of Saxony is one of the last defences of rationalism. In Nuremberg, a more faithful clergy are in that time-honoured seat of the Reformation, deserted by the people. In Breslau—the stronghold of Silesian Lutheranism, only a third of the Protestant population are church-going,—the public-houses are forty times the number of places of worship, and the proportion of illegitimate births is one in four. Stettin—the chief city of Po-

merania—a country long the most simple-minded in its adherence to the earlier faith—seems now, partly by the corrupting influences of its position, as for Germany the key of the Baltic, and partly by the general march of decay, sunk to the most deplorable depth of Pagan, and worse than Pagan immorality. In a population of 50,000, the church-attendance is only 7 per cent. The number of persons in jail has doubled since 1851, their crimes being mostly committed under the influence of strong drink. One person in seventy lives by prostitution. The number of divorces yearly (which the Prussian law allows) is one hundred. The poorest classes pawn their furniture to take part in masked balls and trips of pleasure. A large portion of the wages of labour is spent on public lotteries, and even the gifts of charity are sometimes absorbed in the same abyss. During the prevalence of cholera, some months ago, even when the dead-cart was going daily through the streets, there was not the least decline in the numbers that frequented the public-houses and places of amusement, and (horrible to relate!) when lately a clergyman was called to a domestic baptism, in presence of a large number of friends of the family—it turned out that two children were presented instead of one—both of the same age, both by sisters, and both by the same father, and that father the husband of one of these two—a complication of atrocities, which was regarded with the greatest *sung froid* by the troop of guests that had come to the christening-party.

This dark picture might easily be painted on larger canvas. But we have no wish to dilate—far less to convey the impression of unkindness to Germany in such delineations—the materials for which, to their honour be it spoken, Germans in their public confessions and lamentations have themselves supplied. Doubtless details equally harrowing could be selected from our own religious journals and city-mission reports, as dealing with certain exceptional cities and certain abandoned and neglected classes of our population. But we honestly think that as characteristic features of our national religious condition, even in great cities, nothing parallel could be adduced: and it may be fairly put to the general sense of Britain, whether she is prepared by relaxing her reverence for God's word and day, to open the flood-gates of those evils from which Germany is only beginning slowly to emerge. There would be no escape were the educated mind of this country once brought—as in some cases it threatens to be—to the state of the German educated mind, so emphatically described in the late Berlin Kirchentag by Dr. Wichern, whose knowledge of public opinion, high and low, is probably unsurpassed, and whose moderation of tone contrasted with the more Jeremiah-like despondency of other speakers, "Be not de-

ceived. All things tend to the creation of two distinct worlds,—or rather they are created already. Our educated classes read the Bible no more: and judge of all things human and divine by another standard. The literary world is hermetically sealed against us; and to reconquer it requires a miracle of faith and effort."

What then are the measures by which this great and long-neglected work of restoring the ascendancy of Christianity in Germany, and thereby correcting such tremendous evils as have been glanced at, is now re-attempted? An answer to this question will open up the whole field of struggle, but we trust also, of progress, over which it is the aim of this article to travel; and may set in a somewhat clearer light to many persons in this country the peculiar difficulties of German Protestantism. We abstain altogether from the rich and fertile subject of the conflict with Rome; confining ourselves to the efforts of the Protestant Church towards its own reformation, reorganization, and efficient action within its own territory. We shall arrange our remarks under the four heads of *Doctrine, Government, Worship, and Domestic Missions*, and give unity to the whole by considering the movements referable to each topic not as separate and isolated phenomena, but as manifestations of one great common effort to Christianize, and to Christianize after one type, the whole of nominally Protestant Germany.

We begin with *Doctrine*, because in treating of every ecclesiastical matter, this must hold the first place. Doctrine is to the Church what the blood is to life: and to disparage doctrine under the name of dogma is either silliness or hypocrisy. It is a necessity of the mind to make doctrine vital; as is shown by the conduct of those who affect to undervalue it: for the basis of their own holy or unholy Catholic Church is always a creed, for which they are as dogmatic as the bigots of orthodoxy. The first pleasing symptom of the German Church is the very general and increasingly cordial recognition of this principle. The supercilious latitudinarianism which so long reigned is on the wane. An earnest conviction has supplanted it, that faith is the first of Christian graces, and necessary to love and to good works—nay, what is for Germany much harder to pronounce—necessary to salvation. A more decided impress is set upon all the leading organs of doctrine than even before the Revolution of 1848. What was before dubious has become sound; what was before distinct has grown loud and even piercing. The so-called formal and material principles of the Reformation—viz. the supremacy of Scripture—and justification by faith—with all that naturally clusters around them—make up the body of doctrine which is now in the ascendant. It is so in by far the most influ-

ential chairs of the different universities—probably the majority as to number; and the same may be almost said of the pulpits; though here the point of numbers is more doubtful.

No University, except perhaps Giessen, remains still unsubdued by the movement party. Tübingen is now wrested in a great measure from Baur and his negative co-adjutors; and Leipzig has ceased to bow to the sceptre of mere critics and lexicographers. Meanwhile, the men of the middle school, who have constantly approached, by paths of their own, the biblical or confessional orthodoxy of the more advanced, may be said at last to have reached it; and in the persons of Nitzsch and Hengstenberg, in Berlin, these two sections may be declared to have so coalesced, as while retaining their separate colours, to differ in nothing essential. The formation of the minds of the present and next generation is in the hands of men—from Heidelberg to Königsberg—who have not only broken with rationalism, pantheism, and spurious criticism, but actually conquered them; and of whom the most eminent (with rare exceptions) are as distinguished for attractiveness of personal piety as for learning and zeal. The party of unbelief with the doubtful exception of the Tübingen school are silent. Every thing but the theology of the Reformation is driven from the literary field; and the general discredit into which speculative philosophy has fallen—which, indeed, is now numbered with the acts of the Frankfort parliament, has greatly contributed to the victory of a pure and unsophisticated Christianity. The great majority of the younger theologians are found to hold fast Evangelical truth; and Dr. Tholuck, who has been as much honoured as any other in bringing about the change, referred to it in Elberfeld with astonishment, and contrasted the better day he had lived to see, with his own youth, when an attempt was made by a worthy man in the vale of Barmen, to comprise in one catalogue all who were known over Germany to believe in Jesus Christ as the only-begotten Son of God.

So far as the existing pulpits are concerned the inquiry is both more difficult in itself and complicated by the wide local diversities of a great country. As a whole it may be asserted, that the German pulpits lag a good deal behind the universities in point of coherent and declared evangelism; and though in the most prominent and far resounding there is a great revival, the majority it is to be feared can hardly yet be spoken of as rescued from error. Some ten years ago the general impression was, (of course statistics were impossible,) that of the fourteen or fifteen thousand Protestant clergy of Germany one-third might be in the ranks of rationalism, old and new; one-third tinctured with the latitudinarianism of Schleiermacher; and a remaining third attached with more or less decision to the doctrines of the con-

fessions. There was probably here an over-estimate both of the Schleiermacher and confessional school; and it would have been nearer the truth to have assigned to rationalism almost the half at that period. Now, there can be no doubt that the two latter taken together have a decided majority, and that the confessional party have so advanced at the expense of both the others as probably not to come far short of their united strength. This seems beyond question in Würtemberg, the Prussian Rhine provinces, and Westphalia, and even in the eastern provinces, perhaps also in Baden, Rhenish Bavaria, some parts of Hanover, and in most of the great cities; while in the Hessian States, Nassau, Mecklenburg, and the whole Thuringian and Saxon districts, the balance inclines heavily the other way.

Two features are here worthy of notice,—a growing reserve on the one side, and a growing earnestness of speech and action on the other. We speak for simplicity's sake of two parties rather than three; for the section influenced by Schleiermacher and holding to his doctrines, has, as a distinct party, been of late so weakened that it seems likely to merge, the better half in the more advanced orthodoxy, the weaker and worse in the dead immobility of rationalism. In the pulpit, then, the rationalizing party, like its leaders from the chair and the press, is become conscious of its moral weakness, and is put on the defensive. We do not mean that its adherents have assumed a polemical attitude, characterized by the bitterness of conscious defeat and a resolution to fight for the last inch of ground; but rather that they have learned to practise reserve in the obtrusion of their anti-symbolical peculiarities, and even to colour them with the phrases and something of the sentimental unction of orthodoxy. An undisguised, unmitigated attack on any well-known article of the Apostles' creed, or a blunt declaration of unbelief in any strongly-marked passage of Scripture, would excite too much scandal to be risked in the pulpit. The excesses of the Friends of Light, and the miserable figure made by the rationalist clergymen, who, as in Baden, declared for the Revolution, have made their fellows—where they have not been taught better lessons—at least too wise in their generation to hazard identification with these martyrs of enlightenment. A smooth and decent Pelagianism, delivered in tones more dulcet or more leaden, is now the staple of their ministrations; and all the angles of heterodoxy are as carefully rubbed off as possible. Coincident with this doctrinal modification, and deserving of notice here as an evidence of the spread of religious earnestness, is the improved attention of the party to the proprieties of clerical demeanour. It would be an outrage on truth to represent the rationalism of the pulpit in its worst state as unadorned with many fair examples of civil and

social virtue. It was so common as not to imply any serious hypocrisy on the part of its adherents, with the invariable tendency of that vice to degrade the moral character. Nevertheless, the standard of clerical decorum was sadly reduced; and spiritual-mindedness was out of the question. The youthful candidate presented to a living by court influence or private patronage, (the choice of the people in those degenerate days would have been no better,) having huddled over his examinations before the consistory, and wriggled through a quasi-test of orthodoxy,—abating in after life the exceptions where he maintained a manful struggle with the help of literature, or rose by native elevation of character into an atmosphere of respect and confidence,—was apt to diverge into mean and crooked ways, in order to fill his basket and store at the expense of his parishioners, waging a potty warfare about glebe-lands and surplice offerings; or if he happened to be a nobler spirit, fresh from university renown, and bearing perhaps a sabre-cut or two as mementos of college duels, became the leading sportsman of the parish, dividing the Sunday between “duty” and a shooting excursion, or acting as chaplain to the freemasons’ club, tavern, and theatre. This age is gone by, or at least fast passing away. Dr. Hengstenberg, indeed, declares, in his last year’s review of the German ecclesiastical world, that there are very many clergy in every province (he is speaking of Prussia) to all human appearance incorrigible, and so deeply sunk in the eyes of their congregations, that no remedial measures—such as Church visitation, will avail them. But the same faithful censor admits that a still greater number are improvable and improving. And in general it may be said, that though the freer thinking among the clergy still frequent sufficiently the tavern and the dancing-party, either to please the flesh or to spite the pietists, there is such a decided advance in clerical morals as betokens a more earnest feeling all around them.

Still more satisfactory, however, are the evidences of increased boldness and energy, in the teaching as well as pastoral example, of the confessional clergy, though these it would be unreasonable to detail at length. The best German preaching, even of pious men, with a very few exceptions, has been of a too milk-and-water character, neglecting the intellect and conscience, and mainly addressed to the fancy and the feelings, with an adaptation more or less skilful, according to the capacities of the preacher. Inferior, by a long interval in this department, to the masterpieces of French eloquence, it has wanted the intellectual stamina of the Scotch pulpit, and failed in the directness and practical power of the English. The beautiful dialectical exercises of Schleiermacher stand alone; and they can hardly be

claimed as specimens of Christian teaching based on Scriptural authority. The atmosphere of the German pulpit has seemed alien to the higher displays of the intellect of its occupants ; and what has been wanting in power of mind has not been compensated for by grave simplicity of statement or energy of appeal. Nothing like the vigour of Barrow has appeared in the colder ages of German Protestantism ; nothing like the life and death earnestness of Baxter in its warmth. The pulpit has not been a citadel of strength in Germany since the days of Luther ; what it was in the beginning of this century may be learned from the fact, that Blair's sermons were actually translated to enrich its poverty by Schleiermacher in the outset of his career, though certainly far inferior to the contemporary productions of Reinhard, and not to be named with the future efforts of the translator. There has, however, been a great progress towards better things—marked by such names as Tholuck, Krummacker, Harloss, and others ; and if the German pulpit is yet much too sentimental and declamatory, it is at least more earnest, and we rejoice to think also more discriminating. There is more of the preaching which is adapted to make men Christians, and less of that which ignores the necessity of conversion, and finds the whole audience "a devout community." There are louder strains of warning and terror than have for long awakened the drowsy echoes. Much is here still to be done. Where the truth is entire it still wants impetus and momentum to urge it home ; and the favourite German style of recommending Christianity as a supply for a want, needs to be varied and vivified by admixture of that still more apostolic style which presents it as an escape from criminal ruin and danger. There is evidently, however, a return to this more excellent fashion of the reformers and the greatest of preachers, who have all stood as between the living and the dead. All the recent sermons of the school before us that we have heard or read sustain this conviction ; and we may hope that the more trenchant and decisive edge of the weapon itself may cut through those semi-universalist and quasi-antinomian sheathings which have hitherto blunted the efficacy of German pulpit Christianity. Among the many other evidences of a more earnest spirit in the promulgation of the Reformation doctrines as the world's sole remedy, may be mentioned the preaching mission of the two fellow-professors in Heidelberg, Hundeshagen, and Schenkel, to the educated classes. The former is known for his able work on German Protestantism ; the latter for his zealous efforts in the German anti-papal controversy. Both may be said to belong originally to the middle school rather than to the older orthodoxy. Such an advance is therefore the more welcome ; and the warm reception which

their unconditional and emphatic appeals on the necessity of faith and repentance have met with in the higher circles to which they have been addressed, shows that this keynote cannot be struck too boldly.

We mention last, as the most decisive evidence of a doctrinal progress, the recent solemn assent to the leading principles of the Augsburg confession on the part of the Berlin Kirchentag of September 1853. This proceeding somewhat resembled the renovation of the covenants in the days of Scottish ecclesiastical conflicts and agitations. This Kirchentag, as our readers are aware, is a free convention from the ministers and members of the Lutheran, Reformed, United, and Moravian Churches of Germany, forming a kind of annual parliament for the discussion of all public questions, and for the advancement of the German Inner Mission.* Heretofore its members had been required to take only a declaration of *ex animo* consent to the Reformation symbols in general, and of their purpose in connexion with the Kirchentag, to act according to them. But this year the farther step was taken of singling out one confession, and that the oldest, and most venerable and catholic—the first doctrinal utterance of the Reformation—as the bond of union in this confederation. No one acquainted with that beautiful confession,—the well-balanced work of Melancthon—the earliest efflorescence of the doctrine of justification by faith, before its aroma had been exhaled by a new scholasticism,—the harmonious expression of all the positive doctrines of Christianity that cluster around that doctrine,—the clear and logical annihilation of all the Romanist errors and abuses that vanish at its presence,—will grudge it this honour, to which, moreover, as the most chivalrous memorial of Protestantism,—next to Luther's stand at Worms, it is well entitled. The assent to this confession after a long and interesting discussion, was given almost without a dissenting voice, by the representatives of almost everything sound and progressive in the camp of German Protestantism. The extreme Lutherans who have refused to attend the Kirchentag from the first, because it imperilled their exclusive orthodoxy, would of course repudiate this act because it did not go far enough, so as to include the Apology for the Confession, Luther's two catechisms, the Smalkald Articles, and the Formula of Concord; in short, the whole heavy baggage of the Lutheran army. Some of the Reformed who were present, hesitated or murmured because it seemed to bind them to a confession of Lutheran origin, though Calvin himself assented to the Augsburg symbol. While, of

* For a sketch of the formation of this assembly in Wittenberg in 1848 and its subsequent history, see No. XXXI. of this Journal, November 1851.

course, the small but respectable minority of German Baptists could not approve of a document which, in the spirit of that age, condemns their peculiarities with unfortunate harshness. But on the part of the clear and overwhelming majority of the German religious world, we have no doubt that the enthusiasm of the Kirchentag in reissuing this confession will be responded to; since the assembly that adopted it, nearly 2000 in numbers, included almost without an exception, all the leading theologians and pastors of the great central masses of German Protestantism—to say nothing of influential laymen, from the Prussian prime-minister Mantuffel downwards; on whom and his compeers, for obvious reasons, no particular stress is to be laid. We could not rejoice in this demonstration of the growth of true theology in Germany, if there were in it any displacement of the Scriptures from their supreme position,—any attempt by a side-wind to forward Lutheran peculiarities at the expense of Reformed—or even the shadow of a renunciation of the hope of German theology to improve upon the time-hallowed document in question. It would indeed be sorrowful to believe that the movement of three centuries has been only in a circle; and that the hasty work of a terrible crisis, which bears its mark all through, is the perfect form of truth. But against all such misconceptions, the interesting discussions referred to, and the nature of the resolution itself adequately guarded. And, therefore, we look upon this procedure (though liable to misconstruction) on the whole, with much complacency, as the reascent of German Christianity out of the depths of rationalism, to a height where the great landmarks of the past are again in the same line of vision; and the shapes of unbelief are all left below. The bearing of this influential act on German Popery we do not stop to notice. We only advert to its bearing on English Naturalism. The admirers of Germany have now an excellent opportunity of deriving some advantage from their passion. No protest from the moribund rationalism is likely to strip this act of its national character, as the final utterance of German Theology. We expect then recantations and adhesions to the ascendant system. The blind may now escape from the leadership of the blind. And the muddy draughts of old English Deism reimported after a century from Germany as the elixir of life, like Thames water that has twice crossed the line, with nothing new, but the race of the cask, may now be exchanged for the waters of a native German spring, that runs again after the lapse of centuries.

From this review of the indications of progress in doctrine, we now pass to the head of *Church government and organization*, where also an impartial spectator, amidst much that is sadly out

of joint, may discern the signs of awakening religious life and ecclesiastical progress. This whole department, partly from its own complexity, partly from its remoteness from the general field of British ecclesiastical interest, is very little studied or understood in this country; and we do not know a single English work, great or small, whence a clear idea could be derived of those relations of German Protestantism, which fall under this head. We cannot pretend to supply the desideratum in this paper; more especially as we are chiefly concerned to give an account of what is hopeful for the future, and not so much to lay open the exact statistics of what has long been stationary. Our readers will excuse us if we therefore explain, rather by implication than with set and formal purpose, the features of this obscure and untravelled region. We shall glance at the German Churches in *three* relations,—their internal relations, their relations as churches to each other, and their relations to dissent,—out of which, without any separate consideration, will spring the knowledge of what have hitherto been their most important relations, and their most injurious,—their relations to the State.

The Protestant Church of Germany, in its two great divisions, the Lutheran and the Reformed, adopted respectively after some hesitation and attempts at compromise, the two systems of church government, which are denominated the *consistorial*, and the *synodol* or *presbyterian*. It was their common doctrine that the Protestant sovereign was *summus episcopus*, in whose hands the supreme administration, more however as *jus circa sacra* than *jus in sacris*, should rest. But in other points, they proceeded on opposite principles, the Lutheran organizing the Church from above, the Reformed from below. In all probability, Luther's great doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers would have conducted him to the same results with Calvin—as indeed there is abundant evidence that in theory they were one: but the unfortunate peasant-war, and the low state of the Protestant congregations in Saxony compelled him, as needful for the present distress, practically to exalt the power of the magistrate and of the clerical body, and to neglect the representation of the Christian people as such; so that his successors gradually forgot the rights that had at first been admitted, and subjected the whole Lutheran Church to the administration of consistories—as successors in some sort of the Romish bishops—while the authority of the sovereign by whom these consistories were named, was unnaturally extended to a kind of secular popedom. For nearly three centuries this consistorial system in its various modifications has reigned over the different Lutheran state churches of Germany, including a very great majority of the whole Protestant population; while the synodol system nearly resembling that of

Holland, Protestant France, and Scotland, has chiefly prevailed in the Palatinate and on the Lower Rhine, and other scattered seats of the Reformed; though here and there, as among the Lutheran communities of Cleves, it has found entrance into the territory of the rival system. It is not our purpose to bring an indiscriminate charge against the consistorial administration in itself, or to recommend a synodal system of government as an unfailing security of any church either against corruption of doctrine or neglect of discipline and Christian activity. It is generally admitted indeed, that the Reformed Church of Germany was before the late revival of doctrine as deeply sunk (if not more) as the Lutheran in religious torpor and death. But the evils, notwithstanding, of the consistorial system were great and crying, and seemed to grow out of its very working, rather than like the evils of the other system, from the spread of unhappy influences around. The consistorial boards, appointed exclusively by government, one for each province in the larger kingdoms, had at least one half of their members, amounting to six or eight in all, made up of lawyers or other secular functionaries; and even adherents of the Church of Rome were in some countries admissible. These bodies were connected with the government still more closely by being subordinated to a minister of the interior, or to other purely civil functionaries whose jurisdiction over-rode theirs—always with right of appeal. They came soon to be limited to the more internal functions of church government—such as the superintendence of worship, ordination of ministers, examination of candidates, &c., while the whole right of legislation and all questions of a financial character remained with the secular arm. The exercise of discipline over the clergy themselves in many cases fell away to the ordinary law courts; and even the superintendents and general superintendents, who were employed to carry out the decrees of the consistories in ordination of ministers and other spiritual matters, were selected from the clerical body, above whom they were thus exalted to a kind of shadowy episcopal dignity, not by the consistories but by the crown. With regard to the exercise of patronage,—which was all but universal in the filling of vacant offices, and pretty equally divided between the several governments, and lay or municipal patrons,—the consistories were in some states employed to administer that portion of it which belonged to the crown, subject to the veto of the sovereign; in other states they remained unconsulted. A dark picture could be drawn of the negligence and worldliness in the worst times of these consistorial boards, and of the superior state ministries that often engrossed the larger share of their natural functions. The Church of Christ was managed between them as an affair of police. The evils of nepotism and corruption had full

sway in the appointments to the sacred office. Discipline among the clergy was almost unknown. New catechisms and liturgies, purged of the old leaven of the Reformation doctrine, were introduced among a people whom the example of their ecclesiastical leaders had buried in profound indifference. An unlimited tolerance of all opinions save only pietism and zeal for Evangelical truth, was openly displayed; as an example of which, on the one hand, the clerical leaders of the Friends of Light remained long everywhere unchecked; while as an example of the opposite, the ecclesiastical authorities of Hesse Darmstadt, replied to a complaint against the public blasphemy of an atheist, that a person of a *different faith* ought not to be molested. Some of the state papers, which constitute these governing bodies, exhibit the genius of bureaucracy in an amusing light. Thus the Hessian constitution of 1803 runs thus: "To the Minister of the Interior belong *matters of police* in the widest signification of the term, the promotion of popular education; and *consequently* ecclesiastical and scholastic affairs." In the edict for internal church affairs in the Protestant Church of Bavaria issued in 1818, it is solemnly enjoined that a communication to the supreme consistory is to be signed "your most obedient servant;" while one to the consistory is to be signed "your obedient servant!"

While these bodies were thus engaged in tying red tape, and adding to the "Complete Letter-Writer," they passed from lively to severe, to exercise a worse than Papal despotism over the congregations of which the several state-churches were composed. These congregations—still more unhappy than even the clergy under the consistorial system, could not be said to have any independent place of their own. Restricted to confirmation, baptism of their children, and participation of the communion in their own parish—the first absolutely, and the two last conditionally on the refusal of the parish minister to grant a dispensation, they could hardly be regarded to have any rights at all, beyond those of waiting on the ordinances provided for them, and paying the fees for such sacred acts as they employed the clergy to perform—which were generally fixed by a government tariff, like ordinary tolls and customs. Though these fees formed in many cases more than one-half of the income of the poorly endowed Lutheran clergy, the church-member acquired no corresponding rights. No congregational presbytery with lay members existed, to give him a voice in the local church-administration; and the only semblance of a council was a board of church-wardens, limited to matters of secular routine, and either self-elected or appointed by the higher authorities. The benefits of discipline had thus no existence for the more pure and serious, through the general neglect into which the earlier regulations had fallen; for these

had gradually dwindled down from a system as rigid as that of the old Scottish "stool of repentance," through a transition-stage of fines and private admonitions, to an all but hopeless laxity even for the most notorious offenders. And in the election of ministers the whole congregation was passive; the trial sermon of the candidate being, in the great majority of instances, a mere form; and the nominal right of the parishioners to urge objections of which the consistories judged, having long ago perished by desuetude. The famous words of Lord Brougham, as applied to the Scottish National Church, that the resistance of a congregation to an obnoxious minister would not legally avail more than the recalcitration of the champion's horse on the day of a royal coronation, are literally true according to the general practice of the Lutheran Church—continued in most cases up to the present hour.*

While overspreading worldliness and indifferentism thus diffused itself through every branch of the *consistorial* government, the *synodal* among the churches of the Reformed also gave way, with the neglect of discipline which*is its corner-stone, to the influence of the times; and in many cases fell into disuse, or degenerated into an empty routine. It was in a great measure different, however, with one large district—the Lower Rhine—more especially the two Prussian provinces of Rhineland and Westphalia; and the synodal system there preserved, and united in some degree with the consistorial, has exerted, and is exerting a most salutary influence on the whole question of ecclesiastical reform in Germany. Since the commencement of the movement in 1817, this system, in which both Lutheran and Reformed congregations unite, has been worked with an increasing efficiency; and is still struggling towards greater liberty and independence, both for the ministerial body and the people. It is only indeed in comparison with other territories that this can be eulogized; for the shortcomings and errors of this,—perhaps the most advanced form of church-government in Germany—are still serious enough. The royal ordonnance of 1835, which is still in force, commits to church assemblies,—congregational, diocesan, and provincial, constructed on the principle of delegation, and equally composed of clergy and laity,—the power in church affairs, and in the administration of church property, elsewhere exercised by the consistories. But the consistorial body and the higher state-authorities form in all cases a tribunal of appeal, and nothing can be enforced without their sanction, or at least their cognizance. It is true, that in point of fact, these synods enjoy a great mea-

* Most of the above facts are deduced from Richter's standard Treatise on "Kirchenrecht," or Ecclesiastical Law. See especially pages 335-483. But the passages on which the general representation is founded are endless.

sure of independence; but this is rather owing to the liberal spirit of the state-authorities, than guaranteed by the constitution of the church itself. The privileges of the congregations are also greatly curtailed, in comparison of what a Presbyterian system would lead us to expect. The congregational presbytery (*Scottish session*) is not directly elected, but by a complex secondary system—at least in the larger congregations,—while the primary electors are limited to heads of families; nor are the ultimate electors chosen with a view to a particular occasion; but as a standing body which represents the congregation for a series of years. It is by this standing committee in conjunction with the session that vacancies in the latter are filled up; and also that the minister is elected, in those instances—here more numerous than elsewhere—where there is no patronage. There is, however, no provision in the ordinance in question for any popular veto, or even objection to the nomination of ordinary patrons, where this exists; and all the attempts that have been made by congregations under crown patronage, and seconded by the synods, to obtain from the higher powers a voice in a matter so vital have, till now, proved wholly fruitless.

The constitution above sketched is, however, under review; and as a sign of the progress of the age in this direction, it may be mentioned that a transfer of crown patronage, with some limitations, to the congregational presbyteries, is under consideration; and also a proposal to give the highest synod a decisive voice in the election of the consistories. These particular improvements indicate the *two principal desiderata* of German church government: *the introduction of the congregations to a larger share in the administration from below, and the purification of the higher governing bodies from secular influence.* Prussia, which is perhaps the most advanced of the German States, has sought to lead the way in satisfying both requirements. There was published in 1850 the draught of a constitution for her older provinces, which,—omitting in the meantime, by the advice of the theological faculties and other influential persons consulted, the question of diocesan and provincial synods,—aimed at carrying out as a preliminary to further progress something like the principles of congregational presbytery found to work so well in the Rheno-Westphalian territories. Though this draught encountered unexpected opposition both from those who expected more and from those who desired less, and has not yet been generally reduced to practice, there is little doubt that its fundamental principles will ere long be in universal operation, and prepare the more Lutheran provinces of Prussia for the blessings of a synodal administration. Similar attempts followed on the part of Würtemberg, Brunswick, Bavaria, and Saxe-Weimar, to

create bodies of elders with spiritual functions in their respective churches, as the basis of a presbyterial system. These are all evidences how deeply and widely this necessity is felt; and even the more secular church councils previously established in Hanover and the kingdom of Saxony, prove how strong is the tendency towards lay influence and representation. Oldenburg and Rhenish Bavaria carried the principle to extreme—in the interest of a mere political democracy; and attempted after the Revolution of 1848 to build up the whole fabric of church government on the basis of universal suffrage, without regard either to the faith or works of the electors. The general censure of the best friends of a *Christian* lay influence, rising from the universities and churches of Germany, defeated the latter of these experiments; and the former was so shorn of its extreme principles as to take a place, though with doubtful physiognomy, in the above series of reformed church constitutions.

In respect of the other sign of progress, viz., the unloosing of the higher governments of the Church from state control, Prussia as yet stands alone. In the same ordonnance, of date 29th June 1850, which set forth the constitution for the eastern provinces, was announced the formation of a supreme Church Council, to which in all matters of spiritual jurisdiction the entire Church should henceforth be subject, with only an appeal to the king; while the minister of religious affairs should be confined to the external department of the Church, such as the administration of funds and the care of buildings; and in others of a mixed nature, such as questions of patronage and of appointment of superintendents to serve under the Council, should exercise a concurrent jurisdiction. There is certainly great indistinctness still in this decree; and it does not profess to be more than provisional, until a full synodal representation of the Church can be called into being. It will be observed also that an appeal lies still in strictly spiritual matters to the king, by whom this supreme Council is appointed. Only this latter restriction is not regarded in Germany as an Erastian interference with the rights of the Church of which the Protestant monarch in his own person is, according to time-hallowed ideas, the supreme bishop or principal member. And hence this edict, liberally and charitably interpreted, may be looked upon as the first effort towards a clear separation of the spiritual and secular elements of church administration, and the first breach in that iron chain of bureaucratic despotism enveloping the whole German churches, from which all that is most enlightened and liberal-minded, within their pale has long struggled to set them free. It is impossible that the independence of the Church should stop with this victory; and the judicious manner in which this supreme Council have ex-

exercised their powers, must pave the way, unless the development be interrupted, for the withdrawal of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction whatever from the secular minister, and for the government of the Church in its whole extent upon spiritual principles. To complete this self-rule, it would be necessary that the Church itself, by a synodal representation, had a voice in the election of this Council, and also of the consistories subordinated to it; but how long it may take to reach this stage, and what new measures may ere then turn the entire ecclesiastical history of Prussia and of Germany as a whole into other channels, we do not pretend to conjecture. With regard to the synodal system itself, which is still a blank in the larger part of the Prussian kingdom, there are *three* parties all more or less violently opposed to each other. There is the democratic extreme, consisting of the rationalists and the disciples of Schleiermacher, such as Jonas, Sydow, and others, who would throw everything into the hands of the congregations and inferior clergy, probably because they feel that among them their strength yet lies, and who consequently desire synods as a means of weakening the obligation of the confessions. There is the conservative extreme, who fear synods partly for the same reason, and partly from overstrained Lutheran objections to lay activity in contradistinction from that of the clergy and the supreme bishop: with which party are too much identified (though they do not share all its pseudo-Lutheranism) Drs. Hengstenberg and Stahl. And there is, lastly, the moderate party, headed by Dr. Nitzsch,—perhaps the most influential name in question of church government in Germany,—who regard synodal arrangements as a necessity of a fully equipped Christian Church, and are prepared cautiously to introduce them in spite of the awful light which the Revolution has thrown upon the demoralized state of the parish communities. An English reader will see in this picture a lively counterpart to the debates in the English Church concerning the revival of Convocation—the Anglicans urging the democratic, the Evangelicals the conservative extreme, while a middle party is not wanting to complete the parallel.

In leaving this subject of the internal Church administration of the separate German territories, while we pay a tribute to the improved spirit in which the old forms are applied to the revival of Christian life, as well as new ones created, we must deplore the extreme complexity and cumbrousness of the entire system. We have spared our readers details intolerable in their multitude and conflicting in their operation. Hardly any mind can master or retain the peculiar provinces and functions of the minister of religion, the consistories, the provincial governments, the superintendents and general superintendents, on the one system—or of

the parish-sessions, popish representatives, diocesan synods and provincial synods, with their separate officers, on the other,—and when these systems are made to work into each other, the confusion is worse confounded. This is one unhappy feature of the German mind, which is apt to mistake “cycle on epicycle, orb on orb,” for unity in multiplicity. A system so checked and clogged is incapable of efficient working; and the progress towards simplicity of action must be carried a great deal farther before the organization of any church in Germany can be looked on as complete. We see in it everywhere still that *nimiety* or too-muchness, of which Coleridge complained in the German character. The burden of a redundant officialism sits heavily on the church as well as on the nation in Germany. We are reminded by it of the quaint saying of Jean Paul, “that it is the easiest thing in the world to do more than right; the most difficult to do right and no more.”

The *mutual* relations of the German Churches are almost as complex and difficult to understand as the internal structure and arrangements of each separately. Here, however, a spirit of reform seems also at work, however feebly, and however counteracted by sadly hostile influences. To understand this subject thoroughly, it would be necessary to know what is the present state of the two questions of *union* and *confederation* among the German Churches.

Union as yet has been confined to the two great sections of German Protestantism, known as the Lutheran and the Reformed. These starting originally from the unhappy difference between Luther and Calvin in regard to the real presence in the Lord's Supper, developed each a peculiar theology; the former adopting a theory of the incarnation which provided for the ubiquity of Christ's human nature, and His consequent material presence in the Sacrament, so that His body and blood were corporeally partaken of by all, saints and sinners; the latter refusing all communication of Divine attributes to the human nature, and admitting only a mystic presence and participation limited to the faithful. The Calvinian theory, however,—itself the most materialistic of all the creations of the Reformed theology,—was still farther materialized upon the German soil in deference to Melancthon, whose authority was eagerly sought as on this question opposed to that of Luther; and partly through the same influence, the higher views of predestination which Calvin transmitted to other Reformed schools, found little entrance among this party in Germany. The oral manducation of the body and blood of Christ was thus the chief doctrinal difference; and even the worship, government, and discipline of the German Reformed, evinced a great approximation to the

Lutheran; though still visibly of a separate type. The extreme mildness of this contrast rendered all the more inexcusable the bitter party warfare against Calvinism and Crypto-Calvinism, of those strict Lutheran divines, whose bickerings and insults wearied out the old age of Melancthon, and whose successors evinced for more than a century almost a greater antipathy to the theology of the Reformed than to that of Rome. These contests, however, were gradually suspended. The lava of theological zeal cooled into dogmatic petrifications. Political changes exerted an influence, through the conversion of the Brandenburg family, in the person of the elector, John Sigismund, in 1614, to the Reformed opinions, and the rise of that house to commanding power; and, ere long, the growth of rationalism with its false toleration united Lutheran sympathies with the Reformed, and even with Romanists and Jews, in one common indifference of unbelief. It was natural that the religious revival which accompanied the Liberation War of 1813, and the Reformation Jubilee of 1817, and which affected both branches of the Reformation, should draw them to each other in a more living sense of their essential identity, and open a way for proposals of incorporating union,—such as had ceased for centuries. With this motive was combined in many quarters and probably to a much more influential degree, a kind of sentimental liberalism of feeling, widely diffused among rationalistic consistories and governments, which sought to signalize the Reformation tercentenary, by a stroke of progress that should sweep away an antiquated sectarianism, and strengthen the State by the union of the Church. Movements towards union accordingly began “from above,” in that region which expositors of the Apocalypse are wont to call the ecclesiastico-political heaven. Its great patron was the late King of Prussia, Frederic William III.; and the remarks which follow apply chiefly to Prussia, though the union in various forms has also found an entrance since 1817 into Nassau, Rhenish Bavaria, the Anhalt Principalities, Baden, a portion of electoral Hesse, Saxe-weimar, Hesse Darmstadt, and Württemberg; in all about two-thirds (including Prussia) of Protestant Germany.

All testimonies unite as to the singularly unhappy manner in which the Union was introduced into Prussia. It began with a cabinet order, in which the King announced his intention of uniting the Lutheran and Reformed congregations in Potsdam, under the new name of Evangelical, to a common observance of the Lord's Supper, in which he himself would take part. The voice of the Church throughout Prussia was taken in no public manner whatever, as to whether a union was desirable, or how far it should extend, or upon what conditions it should be

effected. Fresh explanations from head-quarters settled every litigated point as it arose, and it became gradually apparent that the union was to consist chiefly in the assumption of the new name, in the joint observance of worship, and especially of the Lord's Supper, according to a uniform liturgy, in the administration of both Churches by a common government, and in the obligation of ministers at ordination, not to the whole formularies of either church, but to their *consensus*, however that might be interpreted. It was not till 1829 that the new liturgy or *Agenda* made its appearance, presenting a tolerable selection of the Lutheran and Reformed elements of worship, with a preponderance of the former, and settling the sacramentarian dispute, by altering the words in the Lutheran Communion Service, "This is my body," &c., into the narrative form "Christ said, This is my body," &c. In the eastern provinces, this liturgy began immediately to be enforced; in the western, it remained a dead letter till 1835. Nor has the promised authoritative exposition of the *consensus* of the Lutheran and Reformed symbols yet come to light; for the attempt made at last, after twenty years' delay by the general synod of Berlin, was a complete failure, and the subscription of the clergy and the confessional status of the United Church as a whole, are still as undefined as ever.

The active measures by which the union project of Frederic William III. was supported, form a dark stain upon his administration, which all the merit of his good intentions as the hereditary leader of Church Union in Germany cannot remove. The machinery of state corruption was made to bear upon the clergy of decided Lutheran convictions in the different provinces with unsparing hand. Refractory consciences were taught to bow to the threat of deprivation. In other cases the simple pastor awoke to find himself by the king's grace a consistorial councillor; and the councillor in turn had an order of the red eagle appended to his button-hole; and then each naturally from his higher point of survey judged otherwise of the royal intentions, and made the court liturgy his own. Recusant congregations had a harder lot. In Silesia, fines and imprisonment followed all who forsook the sanctuaries of their fathers, when driven by these innovations to hold conventicles of their own with their separated pastors. Billeting of dragoons, and the application of martial law, gradually wrought submission to the will of the chief bishop; but not till some thousands of the more indomitable spirits, martyrs of conscience, even if in error, had sought refuge on the free soil of America, or even at the Australian antipodes, from this miserable despotism. It was not till the accession of the present king in 1840, that anything like liberty of worship, even by sufferance,

was granted to the separated Lutherans, whose numbers at this day amount to nearly thirty thousand. Their resistance to the union is a far stronger testimony against it than any spontaneous demonstration ever made in its favour. It did, however, make its way by a kind of passive acquiescence in the new name, new liturgy, and joint government, till it had embraced a great majority of the Prussian clergy and congregations; while many not disinclined to a common observance of the Lord's Supper still kept up their distinctive titles, and cherished their confessional peculiarities.

The resistance which the union had encountered, led to another cabinet order in 1836, professedly declaratory of the first, but which to a considerable extent mitigated the stringency of the order of 1817, and resolved the union into a vaguer and looser connexion than had at first been meditated. This order abandoned the idea of forming a new church, distinct from the old, and guaranteed to each of the now absorbed communions the retention of its own confessions and separate usages, subject always to joint government and common participation of the Lord's supper. A fresh host of pamphlets followed this order, and it became more and more difficult to ascertain wherein a union consisted that brought to birth no new creation, but left the separate rights of the confessions as they were, while it denied them full confessional action. The union also suffered greatly from the efforts of the rationalists, seconded by the disciples of Schleiermacher, who call themselves, *par excellence*, the United party, to loosen, under cover of its ambiguous confessional standing, the entire obligation of the confessions, and to hail the union as the golden age of liberty. In these circumstances, the high confessional party, that had largely multiplied with the advancing revival, naturally came to regard the union with great suspicion, and to push to extreme those Lutheran peculiarities which an earlier establishment of the union upon a new and satisfactory confessional basis might have prevented from re-appearing with a re-awakening Christianity. The most moderate and judicious unionists, Nitzsch, Müller, Sack, and others,—attached at once to the union and to confessional orthodoxy in a liberal sense,—sought in vain to supply the needed explanation of the *consensus* in the Berlin Synod of 1846: but their ill-timed concessions to the anti-confessional party defeated the whole project, and left matters worse than before. Lutheran associations multiplied even in the United church, demanding the restoration of the pure Lutheran type to worship and the recovery of separate government; while individual clergymen here and there restored the old formula in the sacrament on their own responsibility. Things seemed rapidly tending to an angry disruption, when a royal or-

der issued in March 1852, at the instance of the supreme Church Council already mentioned, made the great concession of a separate government in matters of confessional distinction, by allotting these to separate divisions of this council, while such as were common to both confessions should be placed under the superintendence of the council as a whole. Notwithstanding the loud outcry raised by the unionists above-mentioned, and others, against this divided government as ignoring the rights and claims of the Union to a third and equal representation in this council, the measure seems the best that could have been adopted, until the Union had placed itself, by defining its position, on an equally clear footing with the old confessions. The tendency of this recent government step is to urge on the friends of union to frame themselves into a distinct church formed of those congregations, which, on being appealed to, shall declare for this side, while others adjust themselves as Lutheran and Reformed; and though fresh royal declarations and orders have since appeared—the last in August 1853—intended to guard the Union from this perilous result, it is quite possible, through the excited state of all parties, that three separate churches may ultimately emerge, only bound together by a loose federal government—and that rather of necessity than choice; and thus the Prussian union may close its chequered, and upon the whole, humiliating career, by adding one more to the pre-existing divisions. While we deplore the extreme and mischievous exaggeration of Lutheran principles that has threatened this result (for the Reformed party, with hardly an exception, were satisfied with the *status quo*) we cannot deny that the Union has suffered from its own organic defects, as well as its political blunders. We do not share the fears of its able and liberal-minded defenders as to any injury which the cause of true union would suffer from its total miscarriage. Anything is better than an organized hypocrisy. The very agitation of this question for thirty years is a far happier result than the consent of the whole Prussian church would have been in servile obedience to cabinet mandates; and perhaps a useful suggestion as to their own ecclesiastical impotence may be taught the sovereign bishops of Germany by this obstinate vitality of the Lutheran church in Prussia, which, as has been said of Poland, though long ago swallowed, is not yet digested.

While such has hitherto been the fate of the Union in Prussia, it has in other territories already mentioned found a more tranquil acceptance, though even in these also reviving Lutheranism is attempting to make good its claims, and to break asunder what, with mingled justice and injustice, it affirms that man and not God has joined together. It is therefore agreeable to find that another remedy is being sought for the evils of isolation and

division in the great body of German Protestantism, which is likely in the meantime to be much more effectual. This is the path of confederation or free association, which is independent of the interminable perplexities and complications of formal Church government in Germany. The want of communication between the Protestant Church in the separate territories has long been felt. There is no recognised medium of intercourse between them whatever. Each State Church in more than thirty different governments stands absolutely alone, having its own laws of administration, chequered and diversified in the most singular fashion. The Churches even of the same Lutheran confession have no fellowship; Brunswick and Hanover, and even Hamburg and Holstein, standing aloof from each other, and from all the rest of the Confederation. The clergy of each are its own, subjected to its own rules of education and forms of license. Their privileges have to be renewed by separate examination and naturalization when they pass into a new territory; and with some exceptions in favour of private patrons, the general rule is that only natives of the state are eligible to its benefices,—a restriction which inflicts no great hardship on Prussia or Saxony, but is rather too wholesale a protection to the native industry of Anhalt-Dessau or Lippe-Deimold. The last outward link of connexion between the Protestant Churches of Germany,—the *corpus Evangelicorum*, a standing commission of the Germanic Diet, appointed to watch over their joint interests, chiefly in relation to aggressions of Rome, perished with the abolition of the Empire in 1806; and nothing equivalent or in any way aspiring to bind together the State-Churches of Germany in one Confederation was created in its place. It was in 1818, amid the struggles of the German people—since so ineffectual—to create a united nationality, and under the apprehension that by the compulsory separation of Church and State then meditated, the whole fabric of German State-Christianity would fall in ruins, that a bold attempt was made by about five hundred clergymen and laymen, from all parts of Germany, assembled in Wittenberg, to construct a German Church-Confederation, in which all the hitherto divided governments should merge, retaining of course certain functions of their own; so as either to make an effectual stand by union against the infidel democracy that sought to level both Church and State, or at least, by this outstanding organization, to save German Christianity from being resolved into atoms. This was the origin of the *Kirchentag* to which allusion has repeatedly been made in this paper, and whose annual meeting has come to be one of the most prominent events in German ecclesiastical history. It was very soon found, however, that the plan of a Confederation was im-

practicable. The ebb of that national wave, which alone could have floated it to success, effectually stranded it; and the separate consistories and ministers of religious affairs, restored by reaction to their paramount influence, soon made it apparent that they had no wish to abdicate in favour of the Kirchentag, or divide with it their prescriptive honours. With great good sense, this assembly has lowered its position to that of a free association, claiming to deliberate and give advice in all ecclesiastical matters of common concern, and to preside over and direct the internal progress of German Christianity. As its annual meetings are open to all who stand honestly upon the footing of the Reformation symbols, whether they be clergy or laity, Lutheran, Reformed, or United, it has vindicated in point both of right and of fact a thoroughly national character; and its protests, remonstrances, and appeals to the different governments, both civil and ecclesiastical, on vital questions of Church organization and reform, have frequently led to considerable improvements, and even when repulsed have asserted the moral power of a free and united Christian opinion. A great blank has thus been filled up, far more efficiently than by any official arrangement, and that not only between Church and Church, but between the Church and the people; and an organ has been created which speaks, with a more commanding voice than has been known before, to the whole nation. It is probably the best product of the revolutionary times, for it could have been created in no other; and though its own conservative tendencies, and the wisdom of its leaders, keep it from presenting too great a contrast to the enforced silence of all political reform which is now the order of the day in Germany, it strikes an observer as a power from which despotism in Church or State can only suffer, and whose continued existence and growing influence amid the melancholy wreck of other national hopes and aspirations, betoken the finger of God.

Though frustrated in its original hope of being itself the centre of ecclesiastical administration to a united Germany, the Kirchentag has indirectly called into existence a body more nearly approaching the idea of a Confederation than anything previously known. Ecclesiastical rulers from different states and territories, brought into contact by its meetings, and shaken out of the torpor and routine of their old conventions, have conceived the plan of an annual conference, where only men in authority should meet, and in which all the supreme consistories, or other ruling boards of Germany, should be represented. This idea originated at the Stuttgart meeting of the Kirchentag in 1850, and was chiefly fostered by the warm-hearted and liberal-minded Church rulers of Würtemberg, whose administration is,

in general, Prussia hardly excepted, the best in Germany. At length, in May 1852, the first conference of this body took place at Eisenach, under the shadow of the Wartburg, in the very heart of Protestant Germany; and though the deliberations of the persons assembled, representing a decided majority of the Church rulers of Germany, did not extend beyond generalities in regard to polity and worship, there was at least a foundation laid for more important proceedings, and the first step taken towards rectifying the scandalous official indifference towards each other, by which the territorial Churches of Germany have been so long characterized. The only work as yet executed by this body has been the collection—partly at the instance of the Kirchentag—of those German hymns, which may be regarded as national; and at the second meeting of the Conference, last year, this selection, to the number of 150, was approved of and officially recommended to all the German Churches, with the liberty of supplementing it by provincial additions. A journal has also been instituted as the organ of this Conference, containing the record of its proceedings and authorized copies of all important papers in each separate Church administration. Thus the relations of the different Churches are drawn somewhat closer; and the reign of thirty and odd close and exclusive bureaucracies helped on a little to its destined end; at least there is an opportunity for the more retrograde to see eye to eye, if they have any eyes at all, with the more progressive.

We turn from these reciprocal relations of the State-churches of Germany to glance at their attitude towards those Protestants that lie beyond their pale. This has now reached a degree of friendliness, or rather of modified hostility, which may be reckoned among the favourable changes of German Protestantism. Germany had not passed through that course of training in religious liberty which has been so immensely beneficial in the history of Britain and America. Her sole struggle was with Rome; and the terms of the peace of Westphalia, which recorded the result of the thirty years' war, and assigned equal civil rights to the adherents of Rome and of the Reformation, (including both Lutheran and Reformed,) were till lately the statute law of German toleration. The Moravian Brethren came within the terms of that treaty, as attached to the Augsburg confession; and the only other tolerated body was the Mennonites or older Baptists, a small communion in whose favour an exception was generally made. No second struggle arose as in England for a Reformation within the Reformation,—slowly working out, by the reaction of a powerful Nonconformity, the ultimate triumph both of religious and civil liberty. This, the turning-point of English history, has never arrived for Germany. She had

her Huguenots, but not her Puritans. Hence her plurality of State-churches,—Romish, Lutheran, and Reformed, in some territories side by side,—embracing almost the whole population. Hence the long reign of territorialism in the Church and of feudal despotism in the State. The Congress of Vienna in 1815 had little to add to the Westphalian pacification of 1648. The pietism of Spener and Francke in the beginning of the eighteenth century had not taken the form of separation; and, with the exception of the conventicles of Würtemberg, which, to some extent, resembled the Wesleyan movement in England, and did not strongly urge the extreme of nonconformity, hardly anything had occurred to demand a larger toleration. The restored Diet of 1815 promised, indeed, equal civil and religious rights to all classes of its subjects; but it meant only the *already guaranteed* confessions, and was so interpreted by the different governments, which conceded nothing more than domestic worship to *new* communions, and made the public exercise of their religion dependent upon a special permission, which was generally refused. For all, even members of the National Churches, private religious meetings of more than a very small number (in Prussia nineteen persons) were forbidden; and thus the right of domestic worship in the case of separatists, was effectually kept within such limits as barred all approach to recognised public standing. The treatment of the old Lutherans by the late king of Prussia, already detailed, shews in what a state of nonage the beginning of the nineteenth century found Germany on the great question of religious liberty. This, the needless harshness perhaps excepted, was in its principle approved of by learned divines and professors of ecclesiastical law, who logically deduced it from the *jus reformandi* belonging to the sovereign, though that hallowed right was connected with the dearest associations of deliverance from Papal tyranny. The rationalized clergy (sometimes, alas, the orthodox also!) condescended to be the police of the governments in hunting out the stray separatists, whom, probably, their own arid prelections had driven from the Churches, and in laying an arrest upon all foreign activity that sought to supply the religious wants of the awakening nation. The last twenty years have been the crisis of religious toleration in Germany—partly through the rise of a more aggressive section of Evangelical Baptists, partly through the agitation caused by the movements of the German Catholics and the Friends of Light, and partly through the appearance of a perfect swarm of sectaries consequent upon the struggles of the Revolution. The Baptists may have been imprudent and shewn too great a desire,—with which they are generally charged even by the most liberal of the national clergy, to proselytize the most efficient members of the

State Churches, (a charge for which we do not vouch;) but no impartial mind will deny them the great merit of ardent zeal in diffusing a pure Christianity, and of patient suffering under fine and imprisonment, which has at length, in the most influential States, wearied out the arm of persecution and secured the victory of toleration. On the other hand, the masked politics of the German Catholic movement opposed a great barrier in the way of that liberty of worship to which, in most cases, even before the Revolution of 1848, they however attained; and the extravagance of the fanatical-sects, Swedenborgian and otherwise, that have sprung up in Pomerania and Würtemberg since the Revolution,—rivaling the excesses of our own Commonwealth period,—has exposed the infant cause of toleration to the severest trial. Some allowance must be made for governments trembling for their existence; and the horror with which the German clergy—not excepting the most pious—have been wont to regard even the best of all Separatists, is not greater than that of Baillie, Rutherford, and the Westminster Assembly towards the Brownists, Familists, and other (to them) portentous sectaries of the seventeenth century. It may be hoped, however, that the cause of religious liberty has now weathered these difficulties. Its argumentative triumph is complete; and its legislative sanction is more than begun. The most influential States have followed the example of Prussia, which honourably led the way in March 1847, in granting a toleration, not by sufferance, but upon a legal basis, only unhappily burdened by a tax of some nine or ten shillings for each individual in registering his separation from the National Church. Ere long, it is probable, that a similar or greater improvement, which forms a part of all the new constitutions, will be universal; and though petty and contemptible acts of despotism may from time to time occur under the ministry of Massenpflug in Hesse Cassel, or in such territories as Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Schaumburg-Lippe,—where the power of European opinion seems to act inversely as the largeness of the bodies subjected to its operation,—there can be no question that the reign of religious intolerance has received its death-blow in Germany; and that the defects in the administration of a better system will, after a short transition season, pass away. The liberal conduct of the king of Prussia, true, amid many other vacillations, to this idea, deserves honourable mention. The restrictions of the public worship of any purely religious body in his dominions, only takes place by arbitrary excess of jurisdiction, which finds no sympathy in the government; and this the honest public law of Prussia, will become, as it always does, the public law of Protestant Germany. In gratifying concurrence with this amended spirit of legislation was the tone of the

last meeting of the Kirchentag, where, in a lengthened and most important discussion of the whole relations of the Established Churches to the Separatists, it was unanimously agreed that only moral measures could be used to check dissent; while many speakers openly proclaimed that dissent had in many cases had too good a justification, and was a divine correction of the Established Churches and a call to repentance; and others went so far,—in opposition to the general and upon the whole not unnatural determination, to deny in future all church offices and privileges to the separatists, who should be left to their own resources,—that they did not hesitate to express their willingness to re-admit them, (including the Baptists,) at their own request, to occasional communion in the Lord's Supper. Only one speaker—the well-known jurist of Berlin, Dr. Stahl—uttered something like a last dying echo of intolerance; but when challenged by Dr. Merle d'Aubigné, he explained it away: and thus the apparent discord only made the harmony more complete.

The relation of the German Churches to the State will hardly be found, after the foregoing details, to demand any separate discussion. It will be seen that the different civil governments monopolize the whole departments of legislation and superintendence; and that they secure also the lion's share of administration. Different minds will of course judge differently of this state of things, according to their decision of the great problem of the normal relations of the civil and the ecclesiastical power. We have no sympathy with the spirit in which it was sought to divorce Church and State in Germany in 1848, there being no religious interest at work in the movement, and the extinction of religion itself being the avowed object of many of the most zealous of the revolutionary propagandists. At the same time, we regard the reciprocal independence of Church and State, and the absence of patronage, dictation, or control on either side, as the ultimate normal relation, for which the sacred cause of religion itself most distinctly pleads, and for which the whole religious history of Germany, rightly interpreted, lends most instructive evidence. The force of the lesson has even been increased by the more recent struggle of despotism with constitutionalism and democracy. Candid minds, like Dr. Ullmann of Heidelberg, have openly declared, that the revival of the Church in the revolutionary years, when all State influence was withdrawn, offered a most striking contrast to the decline of rationalism at the same time, when it ceased to be under the ban of political disfavour; and the more far-seeing at this moment deeply deplore the prejudice created among the godless and

infidel masses by the attitude of a Church which is placed perforce by political circumstances in the vanguard of reaction, and whose most zealous spiritual activities are thus made to look like a struggle of Protestant Jesuitism to delay the fall of despotic institutions. The all but entire non-existence of a liberal party attached to Evangelical religion, makes it the most difficult task possible, even for those of the clergy whose sympathies are not with reaction, to steer clear of this gigantic danger. It is as in the navigation of the Polar seas by recent adventurers. The fear of being carried off into the Polar pack of revolution and crushed to death, leads them to warp and moor the ship too closely to the treacherous floes that may any day break away and overwhelm it by their fall or impact. While there is little of declared preference for a more free and self-reliant system, there is a deep under current of dissatisfaction with the existing complication. The most influential and enlightened Church party in Germany—the Unionists and Synodists of the Nitzsch school—though extremely cautious in their utterance, evidently accept the dictatorship of the State only as an imperious necessity, and gild it by the charitable fiction of an innate ecclesiastical sanctity in the sovereign as the principal member of the Church. But neither do they, much less the stricter Lutheran party, hold to anything like the English theory of a state-conscience, uttering itself as well by constitutional majorities as by a hereditary royal bishop. The triumph of constitutionalism, whether soon or late, would be regarded as the political extinction of a National Church by its subjugation to laws alien to its own life; and as the same result would more swiftly follow from the restored ascendancy of democracy, the existence of the ancestral connexion is made dependent, with all its terrible drawbacks and risks, upon the stability of despotism. We have not the least idea that a despotic system can long survive, to be the basis of a Church-administration—the *beau-idéal* of this party—where Church and State, like Pleasure and Pain in the Socratic fable, are united by Jupiter only at their summits; and as the result under the other political conditions is, from the above deductions, obvious, we regard it as written in the book of fate, that an ultimate disruption of the entire compact is inevitable; and that the stern but salutary necessity of the Church doing battle with the godless democracy in her own strength, and with no other weapons than faith and prayer, and, it may be, suffering, is not far distant.

The extent to which we have been led in treating of the constitutional questions of the German Church—which are as good

as altogether uncomprehended in this country—makes it quite impossible to enter at any length into the agitations and movements respecting *worship*. Suffice it to say, that for some years past a growing importance has been assigned by the confessional or orthodox party to liturgical influences in attracting the long alienated masses to the communion of Christianity, as well as in counteracting the imposing religious art of Rome. Many projects are afloat for improving the existing liturgies, chiefly by restoring the early antiphonies and collects of the post-Reformation period long disused; for introducing choral singing as distinct from and yet blended with congregational—the monotony of which certainly needs some remedy; for multiplying services where chants, anthems, and responses, apart from preaching, hold a prominent place; and even for holding a short daily service almost exclusively liturgic in every parish or district. These innovations, attended in some influential churches with lighting of candles, crossings, genuflections, and elaborate medieval mysticism in architecture, stained glass and altar decoration, have produced on the whole surprise and scandal, rather than edification or impression. The reaction among the Reformed against this ultra-Lutheran diletantism is strong; and is shared by very many of the most enlightened Lutheran divines and preachers. The liturgic system no doubt has a strong hold in the sacramentarian doctrine which tends to exalt the altar, as the seat of a present Deity, above the pulpit; but multitudes of Lutherans reject this consequence; and the powerful appeal of Dr. Schenkel in the late Berlin Kirchentag, against any undue trust in ceremonialism, urged home by the example of the Church of Rome in seeking to conquer Germany at this day, not by liturgies, but by Jesuit sermons, evidently made as strong an impression upon the more Lutheran as upon the more Reformed part of his audience. One of the salutary fruits, however, of this liturgical awakening, is the attention concentrated on the defective state of the hymn books used in most of the German churches. The manly strength and fervour of hymns of the richest and best period, from Luther to Paul Gerhard, have often been destroyed by the (not less German than English) gift of hymn-book editors, to deprave poetry into doggerel and sentimentalism; while the still heavier curse of unsound and rationalizing doctrine has in many cases been superadded by consistories and commissions ambitious to praise God according to the spirit of the age. Besides, the most hopeless diversity, both in the selection and in the text of the same hymns, has broken up all national unity, and splintered into different and differently set fragments, this

unrivalled brilliant of German Protestantism, beyond all question the most precious in Christendom. The rectification of this evil, as already hinted, is attempted, in compliance with a unanimous demand of public feeling, by the united authorities of the German national churches; and German worship will thus become both more pure and more catholic. A not less laudable result of awakened activity is the attempt to improve the rite of confirmation by imparting to it a more simple and less spectacular and dramatic character; but the same can hardly be said of the effort to revive the ancient Lutheran practice of confession before the Lord's Supper, which—though advocated by men like Dr. F. W. Krummacher, who belong, by education, to the Reformed,—is not likely to find general reception, and is chiefly valuable as indicating a wish to raise church discipline from its prostrate condition. Akin to this department are the struggles carried on, not without hope of success, in Baden, Nassau, Lippe, and other states, to oust the meagre catechisms of the rationalized period from their usurped place in the education of the young for confirmation, and to restore the Heidelberg or Luther's smaller manual. And we may add, (which we do with sincere pleasure,) that in consequence of the spread of juster views of inspiration, an extensive agitation is in progress for expurgating the Bible itself by the extrusion of the Apocrypha from its traditional place in Luther's version, and every other made on the German soil. A considerable section have already given in their adhesion to this reform. It is reported, on good authority, that two of the most influential clergymen in Germany, Sander of Elberfeld, and Kapff of Stuttgart have declared in its favour; though they have certainly taken no public part, that we are aware of, in the controversy which is at this moment in its full career. Two men, whose antecedents might have warranted a different expectation, Dr. Hengstenberg of Berlin, and Dr. Rudolph Stier have come to the rescue of the Apocrypha, not as claiming for it any shadow of inspired authority; but vindicating with stronger words than arguments its use in the same volume with the Bible, as an illustrative document. It cannot be denied that great prejudices obstruct the success of this agitation. But it is so far satisfactory that it is prosecuted now, not as in 1825, on strictly German ground, and between German combatants; so that the cause of truth need not be imperilled by the suspicion of English influence, of which the Germans are strongly, and it must be owned, unreasonably intolerant.

* The sketch of German ecclesiastical activity now given would not be complete, without a closing glance at the subject of do-

mestic missions, including all the extra-official efforts of clergymen and laymen to recover the alienated masses to religious conviction and practice. The alarming necessity for such exertions became glaringly apparent in the year of the Revolution. The Church, though beginning to awake before, was aroused by that catastrophe, as by the thunder of an earthquake, in which all social relations seemed about to fall in ruins about her head. The effect was much the same as that caused by the excesses of the first French Revolution upon England. A great deal of the religion that followed in both cases was the disguised apprehension of men of property and power for their shaking institutions, verifying so far the saying of Lucretius, "*Primos in orbe Deos fecit timor.*" But more in both instances was the result of genuine Christian patriotism, trembling for the ark of God; and it is to be hoped that the impulse will be as long sustained and effective in Germany as it has been for sixty years in Britain. As it is, the most careless observer must notice the remarkable change of sentiment. Not only is Hegel shunned like the *Encyclopédie*, and the demi-gods of the literary sphere, Goethe and Schiller, made to give place to the mighty returning shade of Luther; but a concentrated practical effort, (as yet, alas, all too weak!) is put forth to permeate with Christian influences the long-neglected masses of the population. The Inner Mission, which dates from the first Wittenberg assembly, in 1848, and formed its most hopeful feature, is holding on its career of good, with increasing activity. Innumerable affiliated societies have gathered round it, some previously existing, more created by its influence, which attempt the rescue of the outcast and degraded. Houses of refuge, orphan houses, sick visitation and pauper societies, penitentiaries, young men's societies—intended to counteract the frightful immorality and infidelity of the travelling workmen which circulate from end to end of Germany in thousands—deaconesses' institutions and sisterhoods (without celibacy)—temperance societies, necessitated by the growing increase of the use of brandy; all these and other associations have been called into being or invigorated from this energetic centre. These institutions are all conducted on the strictest religious principle, having the gospel of Christ for their beginning and end. The Inner Mission besides is directly engaged in the work of Christian teaching by its travelling and railway missionaries, and its tract and Bible distribution in hotels, and among the crowds of emigrants that are continually leaving the German shores, as well as among the home population. It has also in conjunction with the *Kirchentag*, of which it is an organic branch, made representations both to the

governments and people of Germany, in behalf of Lord's-day observance, which have in many instances produced a visible impression. It has acted to some considerable degree as a rallying-point for candidates for the ministry, who are scattered, to the number of four thousand, over north and central Germany alone, often in great destitution both inward and outward; and has supplied to the more worthy a means of personal improvement and usefulness in its service. It has also re-acted upon German society at home, by awakening a Christian sympathy for the German diaspora in the great cities of Europe, whose spiritual condition it has held up in all its deplorable colours. Nor has it confined itself to the lower stratum of the social mass, as the title "Inner Mission" might lead an English reader to suppose. It has appealed also to the higher classes by circulating essays suited to their culture; and the admirable papers of Prelate Kapff on "Domestic Worship," and "The Inner Mission among the Clergy," deserve to be placed in the same rank with the speeches of Wichern. These names may be said to form now the binary star of the Inner Mission—the former its author, and the representative of the free associations; the latter its most eminent advocate among the clergy, and the representative of the official Church. The tract of Prelate Kapff, on the "Inner Mission among the Clergy," a tract worthy of Leighton or Baxter, and as completely free from High Church leaven, has been circulated by the Inner Mission amongst all the clergy of Germany, through the local ecclesiastical governments, to the number of above 12,000; the governments of Saxony, Baden, and Old Bavaria alone rejecting the gift, probably from jealousy of interference by a free association, and the first of these expressly declaring that all the duties of the clergy should be enforced in the name of Christ by a body of undoubted and not of doubtful legitimization. This is a sample of the mis-construction which the Inner Mission has had to sustain from Rationalism and High Lutheranism; but it is gratifying to find that the latter has also been excited to good works, if not to love, by this rivalry, and has organized separate missionary schemes on its own purist principle, to its own heart's content and the public benefit. Last, among the happy results of the Inner Mission may be noticed its reaction on the existing means of religious instruction. The churches long closed on the Lord's-day evening have in many cases been opened for service, with the full concurrence of the ecclesiastical authorities, and largely frequented. Attention has been strongly drawn to the evils of the collegiate system, by which in great cities a parish of 40,000 or 50,000 souls is vaguely divided among six or eight parish

clergy, with nothing of the pastoral tie but the name. The immense out-growth by the population of the existing parochial system, which has remained inelastic and rigid for centuries, has been brought before the ruling powers with a view to church extension ; and even a strong opinion expressed by Dr. Wichern of the necessity of street preaching ; which, however, the overstrained etiquette of the German pulpit, to say nothing of police regulations, will probably forbid. Everywhere, however, a healthy activity is radiating from the Inner Mission ; which, while advocating the grand principle of the universal priesthood of believers, prudently conciliates the possessors of office ; and it is possible that even at the eleventh hour its indefatigable efforts and the other labours of the noble-hearted men who form its life and soul, may yet save Germany from the throes of another revolutionary convulsion. On this point, however, we are by no means sanguine ; and it has often occurred to us, with sad presentiment, that all these fair creations of Christian faith and love are only like the flowers that bloom on the confines of the avalanche, or the vines that cling to the sides of the volcano.

We will not predict the religious future of Protestant Germany. Great and radical changes seem to us inevitable and to be only gathering force by delay. For these we believe it to be immensely better prepared than France, which has no Christian golden age to look back to like the Reformation, and whose public heroes are all smitten with the leprosy of unbelief. Even the Church of England is hardly better equipped for the storms of time, for though its inner life be greater, it is more distracted and divided against itself. Whatever the issue of the next few decisive years, we can hardly agree with an opinion of Dr. Merle d'Aubigné uttered with great courage in the presence of the Berlin Kirchentag, that the destinies of mankind have fallen away from the control of the church of Luther, and have attached themselves to the Reformed. That eloquent speaker pointed to Islam, India, China, all moved from England and America, while Germany remained in passive isolation. This, however, is a one-sided statement, and but touches a fragment of the case. We shall not be so unpatriotic as to deny the glorious pre-eminence of the Anglo-Saxon race on the field of missions. Even here, however, Germany has had its trophies, for who can leave out of view the Moravians, or the multitude of German labourers that have served in Africa and India, under the English standard as well as their own ? who can forget that America has absorbed the flood of four millions of Germans that circulates through all her future destinies ? The countrymen of Burckhardt and Humboldt, of Barth and Overweg, do not want sea-board to become as great under

the evangelistic impulse in the cause of missions as these names in the cause of scientific adventure. They are naturalized on this field, and neither England nor Geneva can exclude them. And what impartial mind does not feel the weight of Germany in other and equally vital points to the Christian cause? Every one knows her still dominant European influence, crippled though it be by false spiritualism, in music, painting, and all the fine arts. In science she may have rivals, but not in learning; and even the dreams of her philosophy, to say nothing of its realities, looked at one time solid enough to crush the faith and reason of other nations. From her literature,—the latest-born of the creations of the west, richly endowed peoples like our own, are only beginning to be ashamed to borrow when all is abstracted; and the shock of her theological aberrations, though happily well-nigh exhausted, has made its recoil felt in all the churches of Christendom. Such a people have not yet lost their hold upon the development of Christianity; nor can they shut up themselves, or any one else for them, in an enchanted circle of non-intervention in the great religious struggles of the future. The theology of the Reformation of which they were the teachers—almost the discoverers, and to which in its essential principles they have again returned, will not attain its ultimate purification and triumph without them. And whatever great Christian names may yet arise—greater perhaps than any of the past, the name of Luther—not as a dead historical name—but in its living and quickening influence upon his own countrymen, appears destined to act mightily along with them in leading on that gathering struggle, to which the Universal Church must call both its veterans and its levies from every province, for the final deliverance and regeneration of the world.

- ART. VII.—1. *François Arago*. Par J. A. BARRAL, ancien Elève et Répétiteur de Chimie de l'Ecole Polytechnique, Directeur du Journal d'Agriculture Pratique. Paris, 1853.
2. *Discours de M. FLOURENS*, Secrétaire Perpétuel de l'Académie, prononcé au funéraille de M. F. Arago, le Mercredi, 5 Oct. 1853.
3. *François Arago*. Par M. DE LA RIVE. In *Bull Univ. de Genève*, Oct. 1853, Tom. xxiv. pp. 264.

AMONG the great men who have been the ornaments of their country and their age, François Arago will ever occupy a distinguished place. The philosophers of the Old and New World will not hesitate to rank him in the list of sages of which Newton is the type and the head, while his country will honour him as a patriot who vindicated its liberties and fell in its cause. It is difficult to estimate the claims of genius when national feelings influence the judgment, and more difficult still when it has thrown out its light amid the darkness of political revolution, and has been summoned to the resistance of arbitrary power. There have been men of high name so absorbed in the abstractions of geometry, so dazzled with metaphysical illusions, or so entranced in the regions of fancy, as to forget that they had a country and a home. In such men the hallowed name of liberty excited neither hope nor fear, and among their heartstrings the names of tyrant and slave never found a jarring or a sympathetic chord. The philosopher who has no opinions in religion and politics, or who is ready to adopt those in the ascendant, is unworthy of the name. He forgets that the end of all knowledge is to ennoble and elevate the mind, and to introduce into the social system the harmony and order of the material universe, —thus assimilating man and his institutions to that higher rule where truth, and mercy, and justice reign. The discoveries of science, and their diffusion among the people, would be shorn of their chief lustre did they not contribute to the moral and physical happiness of our species.

Though reared amid free institutions, the chiefs of English science have seldom exhibited that nobility of nature, and that self-sacrifice to high principle which characterize the sages of other lands, and which so well become the student of material nature. Our philosophers are supposed to have fulfilled their highest functions by burrowing geologically in the earth, or floating in ether among nebulae and double stars. Hence it is that the British sage so frequently vegetates in college halls and

professorial chairs; phosphorescent, indeed, with intellectual light, yet resisting the amelioration of our institutions, and denouncing from the bars of his cloister or the gratings of his den the bold and the brave assertors of reform. It is by such men, numerous in England, that the conduct of Arago has been censured, his political labours decried, and his motives misrepresented. They forget that their own Newton, the philosopher of gentleness and peace, girt himself against the encroachment of arbitrary power, and resisted the tyranny of James II. on the very footsteps of the throne.

Our readers will be prepared by these observations to view the distinguished subject of this article not only as a man of science, enlarging our knowledge by his inventions and discoveries, but as a member of the great social body which the Almighty has planted on the different oases of his globe to work out in unity and peace the intellectual regeneration of our race. Reason has her missionaries as well as Revelation, and though they carry on their operations in distant lines, their hallowed influences still converge to one common focus—that goal in the world's destiny, where the race is to the swift, and the battle to the strong.

Jean François Arago was born at Estagel, then a village of a few houses, near Perpignan, in the Department of the Eastern Pyrenees, but now a town of 3000 inhabitants, on the 26th February 1786. His father, who had but a small patrimony, was treasurer to the mint at Perpignan, and his mother was an active and intellectual woman, who made great sacrifices for the education of her numerous children. François was the eldest of a family all of whom have distinguished themselves in their separate careers. His two brothers, John and Joseph, were distinguished officers in the service of Mexico. John died in 1836, and Joseph is still in that country. James and Etienne were distinguished in literature. The latter is now an exile from his country in consequence of his political opinions. Arago had also two sisters, the elder of whom died several years ago, and the other is married to M. Claude Louis Mathieu, an eminent astronomer at the Observatory, and Member of the Academy of Sciences, whose amiable manners and great acquirements we had an opportunity of witnessing when discharging along with him the duties of a Juror in the Tenth Class of the Great Exhibition of 1851.

The ambition of being a soldier, an officer of artillery, was the first aspiration of young Arago. His father was anxious that he should study for the law, or for some administrative office, but the military passion prevailed, and an incident occurred which determined his choice. Having one day encountered an officer of engineers, who was drawing plans on the ramparts of

the town, he asked him what steps he should take to obtain the right of wearing so fine a uniform. To be received as a pupil of the Polytechnic School, was the reply;* and from that moment the career of Arago was marked out for him,—not that to which he then aspired, but one more useful to science and to humanity.

The earliest studies of our young philosopher were exclusively literary, and he had a particular predilection for the classical writers, a taste which he continued to indulge during his life, and which he was anxious to diffuse as a suitable accompaniment to the high scientific education of his countrymen.* With these tastes Arago entered the Polytechnic School, at a time when there was no Professor of Mathematics. He finished his scientific studies by himself, and that too without the luxury of the thousand tutors which are given to the candidates of the present day,—studying the writings of the original authors—the treatises of Euler, Lagrange, and Laplace, and not the manuals of the second and third order in which the youthful intellect finds nothing to excite it. Arago did not at first understand all that he read, but he was encouraged by the sentiment of D'Alembert, "Go on, and the light will come to you."

In 1803, when he was in his seventeenth year, and self-educated, he was received at Toulouse by the younger Monge, the first of his class; and at the end of a year his devotion to the study of the sciences, and his acquirements, which greatly surpassed those of his comrades, induced him, with the advice of the celebrated Monge the elder, to attach himself to the Observatory at Paris, where he devoted himself to inquiries of the highest importance to astronomy and physics.

* Our literary readers, who, like ourselves, did not expect from scientific men such a strong testimony in favour of classical instruction, may be gratified by the passage in the *Eloge* of M. Barrial, (himself an eminent chemist,) in which he discusses the subject. "We may here be permitted to remark, (speaking of classical learning,) that no preparation is more suitable for a great destiny. There is a desire in the present day to abandon a system of education which has produced such distinguished men. A youth between the ages of thirteen and fourteen is obliged to choose between science and literature, and then to receive a course of instruction which is necessarily incomplete. Almost all of them rush into the department of science, and thus enter upon life without any literary acquirements. This is a great misfortune to the rising generation. Arago felt it acutely, and in now expressing our own opinion, so conformable with that of our illustrious friend, we are doing homage to his memory. We are decidedly of opinion that no man is great even in science, unless he has gone through a complete course of literature; and we implore our age not to allow itself to be carried away by a reaction in which the national glory will be fatally obscured if we do not stop in time before we plunge into the abyss. It is not true that we wish to lower the standard of instruction in order to put it within the reach of men of ordinary talent. Such men derive more advantage from that which is above than from that which is below their level. Upon this subject we would wish to be in the wrong, for we love our country better than ourselves,—a sentiment which doubtless was that of Arago."—*Pp.* 8, 9.

As the basis of the decimal system of weights and measures established by the National Convention, who adopted as an invariable unit of measure the ten-millionth part of the arch of a terrestrial meridian, it was necessary to determine with great accuracy this minute fraction. Delambre and Mechain had already measured the part of the meridian between Dunkirk and Barcelona, but it was necessary to continue the measurement to the Balearic Islands in the Mediterranean. This arduous task was entrusted to M. Biot, and to Arago, who was his junior by twelve years, and to two Spanish Commissioners, MM. Chaix and Rodríguez. On this great errand the two French philosophers set out for Spain in 1806, on a footing of perfect equality, and commenced a journey which, as far as Arago was concerned, was marked with adventures the most curious and often the most dramatic. Biot and Arago were stationed on the summit of Mount Galatzo, one of the highest of the Catalanian branch of the Eastern Pyrenees, while the Spanish Commissioners occupied the summit of Mount Campcey in Iviza. The tents in which they dwelt were pitched on high peaks, which often had little more than twenty square yards of surface to allow them to make the fire-signals to one another during night which were necessary for fixing their respective positions. In these cold and desolate regions our astronomers remained for several months, exposed to the severe cold which prevails on those lofty summits and to the fierce blasts which occasionally sweep over them. The tents in which they lived were frequently blown down, and their lives were endangered by the attacks of robbers, the chief of whom afterwards became the protector of the men of science.

In order to give an idea of the risks to which they were exposed from the ferocity and ignorance of the mountaineers of Catalonia, Arago used frequently to describe the state of civilisation in Spain scarcely fifty years ago. In 1807 the tribunal of the Inquisition still existed in Valentia. It did not, it is true, condemn its victims to be burned alive; but a woman having been accused of sorcery, it was decided by that terrible tribunal that she should be paraded through the streets of the town sitting astride upon an ass, with her face turned to its tail, and having the upper part of her body naked down to her girdle. The poor woman was smeared with honey, and when a drapery of hen-feathers had been thus made to adhere to her body she was exposed to the gaze and ridicule of the mob. "Here is an example," exclaimed Arago, in describing this scene, "of the kind of spectacle which was presented to the people at the beginning of the nineteenth century, in one of the principal towns of Spain, the seat of a celebrated university, and the resi-

dence of numerous citizens, distinguished by their knowledge, their bravery, and their virtues. Let not the friends of humanity and civilisation be disunited, but form an indissoluble band, for superstition is ever on the watch and ready to seize her prey."

In the month of April 1807, the work of our astronomers was sufficiently advanced to permit M. Biot to return to Paris to give an account of the results which had already been obtained. The operations which were necessary to unite the island of Majorca with Ivica and Formentara were thus left in the hands of Arago and M. Rodriguez, and they succeeded in obtaining by a single triangle the measure of a parallel amounting to a degree and a half. At this time the rumours of the war which broke out between France and Spain began to create a suspicion in the minds of the inhabitants of Majorca, that the fires which blazed at the signal station on Mount Galatzo were telegraphic messages sent to the invading army, and that the instruments, and all the proceedings of the astronomers, boded mischief to their country. Arago was therefore denounced as a spy, and his life was saved only from his having been arrested by the authorities. He was imprisoned on the 2d June in the citadel of Belver; but as he was scarcely safe under the protection of its ramparts, behind which he continued to work, he resolved to make his escape, and having embarked for Algiers, with his instruments, on the 28th July, he succeeded in reaching it, after a favourable passage, on the 3d August. After a residence of ten days in that city he embarked for Marseilles in an Algerine frigate, procured for him by the French consul, but no sooner had this vessel reached the Gulf of Lyons, and was in the sight of the coasts of Provence, than it was captured by a Spanish privateer, and carried to Rosas on the 16th of August. In this new position Arago was obliged to assume the character of a travelling merchant, and by the aid of a thousand devices he was not discovered by those who had known him when in Mount Galatzo, and who had been more and more convinced that he was a political spy. He was at first confined in a wind-mill, but on the 25th September he was imprisoned, along with the Algerine crew, in the Fort of Trinity, from which, after three weeks' confinement, he was transferred, on the 17th October, to the hulks at Palamos, where he endured a thousand tortures, and was almost starved for want of food. Indignant at the insult offered to his flag by the Spanish privateer, the Dey of Algiers demanded and obtained from the Spanish Government the liberation of Arago and the whole of the crew; but his activity on this occasion was not roused by the consideration that a French philosopher had been taken prisoner in one of his ships. The ship had in its

cargo two real lions, which the Dey had sent as a present to the Emperor Napoleon, and as one of them had been killed by the Spanish sailors, his threat of reprisals was more energetic and successful than it would otherwise have been.

Anxious to return to his native country, after so many misfortunes, Arago again embarked for Marseilles, on the 28th November 1808, but, just as the ship was about to enter the harbour, a violent hurricane drove it to sea, and cast it on the precipitous coast of Sardinia, which was then at war with Algiers. Being thus prevented from landing, the vessel, in a shattered condition, made for the coast of Africa, and on the 5th December reached Bougia, about three days' journey from Algiers. Assuming the dress of a Bedouin Arab, and protected by a Marabout, Arago arrived in Algiers on the 25th December; but, unfortunately for our pilgrim philosopher, a revolution had taken place in the palace,—the Dey who had rescued him from the hulks at Palamos had been beheaded,—and the new Dey threw difficulties in the way of the departure of Arago, whom he believed to be laden with riches. At this time there was a desire for a war against France; and Arago would have been thrown into the slave prison, where opposite the coasts of France so many men and women of all nations have been martyred, had not the Danish Consul taken the philosopher under his protection. Fortunately for our friend, the brutal Dey was hung, and Arago again quitted Algiers on the 21st June 1809, after a detention of more than six months. On the 1st of July, when the vessel in which he had embarked was in sight of Marseilles, it narrowly escaped from an English cruiser which had given it chase; and with all his instruments, and manuscripts, and plans, saved from so many disasters, Arago entered the Lazaretto of Marseilles on the 2d July, thus gloriously terminating a career of labour, misfortune, and suffering, which, in the cause of science, he had endured for nearly three years, and to which few philosophers have ever been exposed.

Having received no intelligence concerning him since the return of Biot, his friends in France believed that he was dead. His poor mother had even in her hands the watch which Arago had been obliged to sell at Rosas. She had caused many masses to be said for her favourite son, and, as he himself had often with much feeling told his friends, she caused as many to be said in gratitude to heaven for having restored her child.

Afflicting as had been his misfortunes to himself and his family, they were but the prelude to a glorious career. The first letter which he received in the Lazaretto of Marseilles, was from the illustrious Humboldt, who knew him only by his misfor-

tunes; and from that hour there commenced between these distinguished men a friendship which, to use the words of Arago, "continued during forty-four years without a cloud to disturb it," a sentiment reciprocated with equal warmth by his friend. On his arrival in Paris, where his scientific labours had been appreciated, and his sufferings deplored, he was specially honoured with the patronage of Laplace, Legendre, and Monge; and such was the estimation in which he was held by the philosophers in Paris, that at the age of twenty-three, when a vacancy took place in the section of astronomy in the Academy of Sciences by the death of Lalande, he was elected on the 17th September 1809, by forty-seven out of fifty-two votes. In asking the question, how it happened that the extreme youth of M. Arago did not prevent him from being admitted into so illustrious a body, when an election is often the recompense for a long life wholly devoted to the science, M. Barral has no hesitation in replying, that at the time of his election he had done more than many of the academicians at a more advanced age; and that the Academy was not only encouraged by the high promise of his talents which was magnificently fulfilled, but that they actually rewarded him for the work which he had done.

"He had, indeed," says M. Barral, "executed in concert with M. Biot, a very laborious and very delicate work, on the determination of the co-efficient of the Table of Atmospheric Refraction, so useful in the correction of Astronomical Observations. He had measured the refractive powers of different gases, that is to say, the action which they exercise in causing the rays of light to deviate from their path, an inquiry which had not previously been attempted. He had determined the ratio of the weight of air to that of Mercury, and obtained a direct value of the co-efficient of the formula, by which the heights of mountains are computed by simple barometrical observations. By placing a prism before the object glass of the telescope, attached to the mural quadrant of the Observatory, he had done much on the subject of the velocity of light, and proved that the same tables of refraction would serve for the light coming from the sun, and for that coming from the stars. This was the first step to a truth now well demonstrated, that the sun is but a star among the innumerable stars which people the firmament. He had, along with M. Bouvard, made numerous observations relative to the verification of the laws of libration, and computed tables eminently useful to astronomers. And finally, he had completed the most laborious triangulation which had ever been executed, for prolonging the meridian of France to the Island of Formentara. Thus might Arago, at the age of twenty-three, have rested himself, without any person having the right to say that he had not paid his tribute to science; but he did not sleep in the academician's chair."

Leaving to a future part of our article an account of the

leading scientific discoveries of Arago, we shall now follow him in his more public career as a professor in the Polytechnic School, a Director of the Observatory, a Member of the Board of Longitude, Perpetual Secretary for the Mathematical Sciences to the Institute, Minister of War and Marine in the Provisional Government of 1848, President of the Executive named by the Constituent Assembly, and when called upon as Director of the Observatory to take the oath of allegiance to the government of the Emperor.

Although Arago, when a pupil at the Polytechnic School, had fearlessly given his suffrage against the assumption of the Imperial Crown by Bonaparte, and was the first on the list to record his negative, yet that great man, who knew the value of an honourable action, and occasionally overlooked it even when directed against himself, never resented this act of juvenile hostility; but, recollecting the courage of the scholar in exercising a right which he himself would in similar circumstances have exercised, appointed him one of the professors of the Polytechnic School soon after his admission to the Academy; and about the same time he named him one of the astronomers of the Imperial Observatory, in which he resided till his death. He was also appointed to the situation of examiner of the sub-lieutenants of engineers and artillery, who had finished their education at the school of application established at Metz. His popularity in these situations was very great. From the extent and variety of his acquirements, Arago was able to give successively five different courses of lectures. Ever anxious as every great man must be who has been permitted to make grand discoveries, to assist those who seem destined for the same high position, he delighted in patronizing youthful genius, and well merited the affection of his pupils. He never failed to defend the Polytechnic School against the attacks of its enemies; and on a very late occasion, in the last work which issued from his pen, he resisted the introduction of certain changes which he thought not only unnecessary, but calculated to injure the character of an institution which had been the envy and admiration of Europe.

In 1818 or 1819, he was appointed by the Board of Longitude to execute, along with M. Biot, the geodetic operations on the coasts of France, England, and Scotland. It was on this occasion that M. Biot measured the length of the pendulum at Leith, and in Unst, one of the Shetland Isles, and the results of the operations of the two astronomers in these localities, as well as of their joint operations in Spain, were published in 1821 in an interesting work, which does equal honour to its authors

and to the nation at whose expense the operations were carried on, and the work given to the public.*

Immediately after the publication of this work, namely, in 1822, Arago was appointed a member of the Board of Longitude, and such was his anxiety to make his talents useful in every situation which he occupied, that in the *Annuaire*, or *Almanac*, published annually by the Board, he contributed every year from 1824 to 1853† inclusive, valuable scientific notices, chiefly on astronomy and meteorology, but often on mechanics and civil engineering, and sometimes interesting biographical notices either pronounced at the grave of distinguished individuals, or read in the Academy of Sciences.

When Arago was appointed one of the astronomers of the Observatory, the Board of Longitude requested him to deliver a course of lectures on Astronomy. This course was begun in 1812, and continued till 1845. It was attended by persons of all ranks,—philosophers, politicians, and workmen, who flocked to listen to the eloquence of the astronomer. Arago had a peculiar facility in bringing down even the higher parts of astronomy to the comprehension of ordinary minds, a faculty so rare that some of the most distinguished astronomers have failed in making their science intelligible or interesting to a public auditory.‡ Arago adopted a method which, we believe, had been tried before,§ by one of his predecessors. When he began to give his course on astronomy, he glanced around his audience to look for some dull aspirant for knowledge, with a low forehead, and other indications that he was among the least intelligent among his hearers. He kept his eye fixed upon him,—he addressed only him, and by the effect of his eloquence and powers of explanation as exhibited on the countenance of his pupil, he judged of their influence over the rest of his audience. When he remained unconvinced, the orator tried new illustrations till the light beamed from the grateful countenance. Arago had nothing to say to the rest of his audience. The orator and his pupil were the Siamese twins united by an intellectual ligament. Next morning, when Arago was breakfasting with his family, a visitor was announced. A gentleman entered—his pupil of the preced-

* *Recueil des Observations Géodésiques, Astronomiques et Physiques, exécutées par ordres du Bureau de Longitude, en Espagne, en France, en Angleterre, et en Ecosse, &c. ouvrage faisant suite au tome troisième de la Base du Système Métrique, en 4to avec Figures, Paris, 1821.*

† Excepting the years 1826, 1841, 1842, 1845, 1847, 1848, 1849.

‡ We have heard the celebrated Dr. Brinkley, who held the popular lectureship of Andrews, Professor of Astronomy in Dublin, the duties of which were to lecture gratis to the public, say that he often went to give his lecture without finding anybody to listen to it. What a picture of the state of education there!

§ We think that Cuvier mentions this method as having been followed by Fourcroy.

ing evening,—who, after expressing his admiration of the lecture, thanked Arago for the very particular attention which he had paid him during its delivery. “You had the appearance,” said he, “of giving the lecture only to me.”

After the entrance of the Allies into Paris, Arago shut himself up in the Observatory, and refused to see any of the distinguished Sovereigns, or other great men who then sojourned in the capital. Humboldt had in vain asked leave to introduce to him the King of Prussia. One day Arago had just risen from table, and had gone into the billiard hall with his friend. The noise of a carriage was heard at the door, when instantly entered Humboldt accompanied by a gentleman, in a cap and travelling dress. “I am setting out for Berlin,” said Humboldt, “and I could not think of going without taking leave of you. Monsieur accompanies me, and I asked him to come in with me, that he might not be kept waiting in the carriage. Arago saluted the stranger, shewed him to a chair, and, without taking any farther notice of him, entered into a long and interesting conversation with Humboldt. At the end of an hour, Humboldt took leave of Arago, and the stranger saluted him and retired with his companion. Scarcely had they gone, when Arago said smilingly to his two friends, “This excellent friend of mine, believes undoubtedly that I have not recognised the King of Prussia.”

When the conqueror of Waterloo occupied the Elysée, Napoleon had abandoned every hope of power in Europe, and looked to America as a place of refuge which he might reach without difficulty, and where he might reside in freedom. With this view he developed his future plans to the celebrated Monge,—“Idleness,” said he, “will be to me the most cruel of tortures. Condemned no longer to command armies, I see that it is only the sciences which can powerfully divert me from mental cares,—to learn only what has been done by others would not answer my purpose. I would wish in my new career to leave behind me works and discoveries worthy of myself. I wish to have a companion who will initiate me into the sciences. We shall afterwards explore together the new continent from Canada to Cape Horn, and in this long journey we shall study together all the great phenomena of the physics of the globe, upon which the scientific world have not yet come to a decision.” Transported with enthusiasm, Monge exclaimed, “Your companion, Sir, is already found. I will accompany you.” Napoleon thanked his friend with emotion, and had some difficulty in making him understand that a septuagenarian would hardly be qualified for so difficult and fatiguing an enterprise. Under this feeling, Monge applied to Arago as a suitable companion to Napoleon, and de-

scribed to his colleague in glowing colours the grandeur of the transatlantic scheme, and the honour of being associated with so illustrious a personage. The young philosopher was to receive a handsome sum in compensation for the loss of his appointments, and a large fund was to be devoted to the purchase of a complete collection of astronomical, physical, and meteorological instruments. The negotiation, however, romantic as it was, produced no result. The English and Prussian armies were now advancing by forced marches upon the capital, and Arago imagined that the Emperor had committed a great mistake in occupying himself and them with such unseasonable arrangements, in place of remaining at the head of the troops, and rallying them under the walls of Paris for a final effort to save their country. He therefore declared that he could not charge himself with scientific researches in the new world, when France might perhaps lose its independence and disappear from the map of Europe. Monge was confounded at the refusal of his young friend. He counted it almost a proof of mental aberration, and again urged Arago to agree to the proposal. The events of the war, however, extinguished all such projects, and on board the Northumberland a less pleasing voyage became the destiny of Napoleon. This was not the only refusal of Arago to quit his country. During the Restoration, he was invited by the Emperor Alexander to Russia to take the direction of the sciences in his empire; but even the hostility of the Government could not induce him to abandon France, and he replied to the offer of the Czar that as long as he had an inch of ground upon which to plant the foot of his telescope, he owed to his country the results of his labours.

In 1816 our author established, along with Gay Lussac, the *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, a monthly journal of science, which has had a most extensive circulation, and which since the death of its distinguished editors, has been placed under the charge of MM. Chevreul, Dumas, Pelouze, Bousisingault, and Regnault, all eminent members of the Academy of the Sciences, and well known throughout Europe by their discoveries. In the same year M. Arago visited London along with his distinguished friend M. Gay Lussac. They paid a visit to our illustrious countryman, Dr. Thomas Young, of which Arago has given the following interesting anecdote:—"Fresnel had about this time entered upon his brilliant scientific career, by his *Memoir on Diffraction*. This work, which, in our opinion, contained a capital experiment irreconcilable with the Newtonian theory of light, became naturally the first topic of our conversation with Dr. Young. We were astonished at the number of restrictions which he made upon our *éloges*, and he

at last told us that the experiment, on which we placed such value, had been published since 1807, in his treatise on Natural Philosophy. This rendered our discussion long and minute. Mrs. Young was present, without taking any part; but as we knew that the fear, really puerile, of passing for learned women, and the dread of receiving the name of *blue stockings*, made English ladies very reserved in the presence of strangers, our want of tact did not strike us till the moment Mrs. Young quickly left the room. We began to make excuses to her husband, when she appeared with an enormous quarto volume under her arm. This was the first volume of the treatise on Natural Philosophy. She placed it on the table, opened it without saying a word at page 787, and pointed to a figure where the curvilinear path of the diffracted fringe on which the discussion turned was theoretically established.”*

Although during the Restoration Arago took no very prominent part in the politics of the day, he yet exercised the privileges of a citizen, and maintained those liberal opinions which men of patriotic minds and ardent temperaments never fail to cherish. It was, however, not till the Revolution of 1830, when the elder branch of the Bourbons was expelled from France, that he was called from the peaceful pursuits of science into the arena of political strife, and rendered a real service to his country by the active part which he took in the Chamber of Deputies and in the Municipal Council of Paris, in favour not only of political ameliorations, but of measures advantageous to science and to the useful arts. He was elected a member of the Chamber of Deputies for the Lower Seine, and attached himself to the party of the extreme left, of which Lafitte and Dupont de L'Eure were the head. Though as a speaker he was fluent and eloquent, he seldom spoke but on subjects which he had well studied, and upon which his opinions were likely to guide an intelligent Chamber.

It was on his report, for example, that a national recompense was awarded to Daguerre for the invention of Photography on metal, an art however in which M. Niepce had made some considerable steps, and for whom Arago procured a part of the reward. It was through him also that M. Vicat obtained a national grant as the inventor of valuable artificial hydraulic cements.† He induced also the Chamber to vote a grant for printing the works of Laplace and those of Fermat. He drew

* *Eloge de Dr. Thomas Young.*—*Mémoires de L'Institut.*

† A notice on this subject entitled, *Sur les Chaux, Mortiers, et les ciments Hydrauliques, sur les Pouzzolanes naturelles et artificielles*, is given in the *Annuaire* for 1846.

up the report recommending the acquisition by the State of the interesting Museum of Cluny, one of the most popular sights in Paris. He took a part also in all questions connected with public education and civil engineering,—in the schemes for rendering the Seine navigable to Paris,—in railroads, electric telegraphs, and the construction of the grand lines of fortification which now protect the capital.

One of the most interesting works, however, which he about this time carried on was the boring of the Artesian wells at Grenelle, which now supply a part of Paris with hot water heated in the bowels of the earth, and by its hidden fires. His friend Humboldt and others had shewn that the temperature of the earth increased as we descend; and independent of the existence of hot springs which discharge themselves at the earth's surface in various parts of our globe, there was reason to think that a well sunk anywhere to a sufficient depth would meet with springs of a high temperature. Arago obtained from the Government successive grants for sinking one of these wells. The work advanced, but nobody thought it would succeed. Mining engineers, geologists, and those who had no right to give an opinion at all, denounced the folly of the philosopher and of the Government. Arago waited for the result; he had predicted the time when the hot water would spring, and it accordingly appeared to the discomfiture of his critics, and to the satisfaction of the people who could wash their linen in water from the bowels of the earth. The terrified savans did not know when it would stop, and declared that the Seine would engulf itself in the wells of Grenelle.

His speech in 1840, on the necessity of extending the electoral suffrage, produced a strong sensation not only in the Chamber but among the people, and in the same year he was elected "Member of the Council General of the Seine," to the duties of which he devoted himself with assiduity.

From his noble figure, which was tall and handsome, and his fine intellectual expression, Arago was regarded as a powerful speaker, to whom the Chamber was always disposed to listen. The following account of his oratorical powers by M. Cormenin, published in 1843, is too graphic to be withheld from our readers.

"Whenever Arago ascends the tribune, the Chamber, attentive and anxious, becomes still, and listens eagerly. The spectators hang over the galleries to see him. His stature is lofty, his hair is naturally curled and flowing, and his fine southern head rises over the Assembly. In the muscular contraction of his temples there is a power of will and of thought which reveals a noble spirit. Unlike those speakers who address the House on every occasion, and who, nine times out of ten, are ignorant

of what they talk about, Arago does not speak except on questions already prepared, and which combine the interest of the subject with the attractions of science. His speeches are therefore quite specific as well as general, and appeal at once to the reason and the passions of his auditors. In this manner he soon comes to master them. The very moment he enters on his subject he concentrates on himself the eyes and the attention of all. He takes science, as it were, between his hands; he strips it of its asperities and its technical forms, and he renders it so clear, that the most ignorant are astonished, as they are charmed, at the ease with which they understand its mysteries. There is something perfectly lucid in his demonstrations. His manner is so expressive that light seems to issue from his eyes, from his lips, from his very fingers. He interweaves in his discourses the most caustic appeals to ministers—appeals which defy all answers; the most piquant anecdotes which seem to belong naturally to the subject, and which adorn without overloading it. When he confines himself to the narration of facts, his elocution has all the graces of simplicity. But when he is, as it were, face to face with science, he looks into its very depths, draws forth its inmost secrets, and displays all its wonders; he invests his admiration of it with the most magnificent language, his expressions become more and more ardent, his style more coloured, and his eloquence is equal to the grandeur of his subject.”

In the year 1830, Arago succeeded to offices of high importance. He was in that year appointed Director of the Observatory, and by his influence in the Chamber, he obtained several grants of money for rebuilding that part of the Observatory in which the meridional instruments are fixed, and for constructing the immense revolving Cupola which is to receive next spring the great achromatic telescope with its parallactic stand. This noble instrument, worthy of the science of France, has an object-glass *fourteen* inches in diameter; and we believe the project of a law has been passed by the National Legislative Assembly to open a credit of 90,000 francs for the erection of the building, and the completion of the instrument. The Governments of France, which, during the last forty years, have ruled the country with such different objects in view, have all given their protection to this noble institution, and particularly to its Director, by whose exertions it has risen from its ruins, and may be offered to the astronomers of other lands as a model for a temple of the heavens. When the last change in the Government threatened to drive him from an establishment which had nearly for half a century been his home, and to the construction and improvement of whose fine instruments he had more or less contributed, he felt deeply the possibility that the means of research created by him—

self might pass into malevolent or hostile hands. He was spared, however, as we shall see, this mortification, and he was allowed to draw his latest breath within its hallowed walls.

In the same year, namely, 1830, he received the highest and most honourable appointment to which a man of science can aspire in France. On the death of Baron Fourier, a philosopher of whom his country has reason to be proud, Arago's talents, and eloquence, and energy of character, pointed him out as the fittest person to succeed that eminent citizen and mathematician, in the perpetual secretaryship of the Academy of Sciences for mathematical science. He was accordingly elected on the 7th June 1830, by thirty-nine votes of his colleagues out of forty-four; and during the twenty-three years that he held this office, he maintained the high character of the Academy, not only by the influence which his position gave him in the choice of the members, whether domestic, associate, or corresponding, but by the communication which he kept up with the academies of the old and the new world. In the capacity of perpetual secretary, it became his duty to write the *Eloges* of resident and foreign members, and though Cuvier, as perpetual secretary for the physical sciences, had gained a high name as a powerful and elegant writer, we venture to say, that the *eloges* of Arago take the first place among the biographies which have issued from the scientific academies of Europe. His beautiful *Life of James Watt*, which first appeared in the *Annuaire* of 1833, was published in a separate volume and translated into English; and his *Analysis of the Life and Works of Sir William Herschel*, which was published in the *Annuaire* for 1842, was also printed separately in 1845. The *eloges* of Volta, Malus, Fresnel, Dr. Thomas Young, Ampere, and Monge, possess much interest, but those of Fourier, Condorcet, Carnot, and Baily, are master-pieces of eloquence, of which we have had occasion to give several specimens.*

In the year 1834, Arago paid a second visit to England, for the purpose of attending the third meeting of the British Association, which was then held in Edinburgh. There his talents and character were highly appreciated. He took an active part in the proceedings of the sections; and at the closing public meeting, where thanks are returned to the different parties who have assisted at the proceedings, he was called upon to reply, which he did with unusual eloquence, to the equally eloquent speech of his friend Lord Brougham, who moved a vote of thanks to

* See this *Review*, vol. iv. p. 380, vol. vi. p. 473, and vol. xv. p. 185. Notices of Prony, Poisson, Puissant, Bouvard, and Gambey will be found in the *Annuaire* for 1840, 1844, and 1850.

the foreign members. On his return to London he paid a visit to Aston Hall, the residence of James Watt, Junior, where he examined those interesting MSS. which enabled him to defend with such unanswerable arguments the claim of James Watt to the discovery of the composition of water.

Educated under democratic institutions, Arago had been a republican from his youth. He had seen, however, the difficulty of maintaining such a form of government in a country surrounded by the autocratic and limited monarchies of Europe. A mighty conqueror had subverted the institutions for which France had made such sacrifices of blood and treasure; and on the return of the ancient dynasty to power, the friends of liberty lost all hope of regaining the form of government which they loved. The second expulsion of the elder branch of the Bourbons, and the establishment of the house of Orleans on the throne, though they were not events in any way favourable to democratic expectations, were yet steps in the march of political improvement. It had been seen in England, how the expulsion of the Stuart family and the accession of the house of Brunswick had advanced the great principles of personal and social liberty, and contributed to the glory and greatness of the nation; and Frenchmen had a right to expect from Louis Philippe and his dynasty the same social rights, and the same national prosperity. The patriot who entertains republican views, not from personal motives, but from a conviction that such a form of government is best fitted to promote the happiness of the nation, will cheerfully take his part in a limited monarchy, and endeavour to obtain from it all the social advantages which he anticipated from a republic. Such, we believe, was the feeling of Arago and many distinguished Frenchmen. Louis Philippe was the sovereign of their affections—the chosen king of the French—the descendant of a republican ancestor—a pupil of the revolution, who learned, without imbibing, many useful lessons in its school. He was, therefore, the man to whom the republican patriot could entrust the guardianship of his rights, and from whom he might expect, without so slow a process, all the liberal institutions which the English people had obtained from their sovereigns, between the reigns of Queen Anne and Queen Victoria. These expectations, however, were disappointed. The patriot republican anticipated neither glory nor good for his country from the new dynasty. Europe was disappointed that a fixed government had not been attained in France, and the friends of English liberty were grieved that their neighbours, in whose tranquillity and good government they had the deepest interest, could not wrest from the high autocracy of their king, those constitutional advantages which they themselves enjoyed.

The revolution of 1848 was, therefore, not unexpected. It had been foreshadowed by repeated attempts to cut short the monarch's reign, and in England it was less deplored than it would have been, from the political faithlessness of the government which it annihilated. In an emergency so sudden, when a throne is shivered as if by a stroke of lightning for which no preparation can be made—when all evil spirits are let loose, and all good ones paralyzed, Arago was summoned from his peaceful observatory to stay the revolutionary tempest which supervened. Himself and a few noble patriots, whom posterity will honour, formed the provisional government of the hour. To him was entrusted the portfolios of the ministers of War and Marine, *ad interim*—two functions which we believe were never before imposed upon one individual. How could the most experienced of our statesmen conduct such complicated affairs even in seasons of tranquillity? How could they conduct them on the overthrow of a government when an infuriated mob was watching every movement; and when demands which could not be complied with were made every hour by patriots oppressed—by citizens proscribed—and by the thousand and one applicants who looked either for justice or mercy or advancement from a government which they had assisted to establish?*

Arago continued to discharge faithfully the duties of his double office from the time of the flight of the royal family till the nation assumed the management of its affairs. After the Constituent Assembly had been formed, he was appointed president of the Executive Committee, in which he laboured for the benefit of the nation. He abolished all political oaths; and when urged by high influence to promote objects consonant with his own wishes and opinions, he nobly answered, "that in everything of a political nature we cannot without danger abandon ourselves to the inspiration of the heart." When Minister of Marine, he ventured on great and salutary reforms. He not only abolished the punishment of flogging in the navy, but considerably augmented the rations of the sailors. The most difficult, however, of all his tasks was the abolition of Negro Slavery in the Colonies. A formidable league was marshalled against this scheme



* The scenes which took place under such circumstances, must have often been strange and even ludicrous—scenes which the malignity of political satire has, of course, described and exaggerated. Public men are accustomed to this species of martyrdom; and we need not greatly wonder that Arago, in the exercise of his two high offices, became the subject of one of these effusions. But we do wonder that this satire was repeated, and that the conduct of Arago was the subject of animadversion in an English Journal, sustained by the Church, the aristocracy, and much of the science of England. We shall presently have occasion to wonder still more at a more ferocious attack in the same Journal upon the dying patriot.

of humanity. The fears of the community were roused by the worshippers of mammon, and it was believed by the timid enemies of change, that the abettors of slavery would deluge the colonies with blood. "It is a terrible responsibility," said Arago to his Secretary, "that we are about to take,"—but his ardent love of humanity overbore every other consideration.

During the awful carnage of the days of June, Arago marched at the head of the troops carrying a white flag against the barricades of the 12th Arrondissement, imploring the infuriated multitude to pause in their murderous career and agree to terms of peace. His efforts, however, were fruitless. His character, once so highly appreciated in that quarter, had lost its hold over unbridled passion, and vain was his attempt to curb the frantic war-horse of popular fury—*injicere frena vaganti*. The maddened assailants behind the barricades even levelled against their best friend the fire of their musketry; but though he fortunately escaped from the scene of slaughter, his health suffered a shock on the occasion; and we believe that it was from the blaze of the musketry, directed as it seemed against himself, that that affection of his eyes arose, which terminated in total blindness.

With this fatal encounter terminated the political career of Arago. Exhausted with fatigue physical and mental—disappointed of that glorious future which he had anticipated for his country, he never again took an active part in the affairs of the state. He had been elected a deputy to the Chamber for the Eastern Pyrenees, his native department, but he gave his vote in silence, watching with an anxious heart the development of events still impending over his country. France was still a republic; but its history gave him no guarantee that it was safe from ambition. The almost unanimous election of its President was an act of devotion to the name and memory of a great man, and was so far a consolidation of the republic. He therefore believed even then that his countrymen were republicans; and when we saw him in Paris in 1850, he still looked forward to the regeneration of France. His mind, however, then in its full intellectual vigour, was more occupied with the affairs of science than with those of politics. Warned by the disease which had attacked him, and which at that time was considered as a softening of the brain, he resolved to spend the few years upon which he could reckon, in preparing for publication various MSS. which he had written, and an account of various original researches which his political occupations had prevented him from communicating to the Institute. He was at this time, also, engaged in drawing up a narrative of the events of 1848, which we had agreed to translate, but which, we fear, other more urgent duties may have induced him to lay aside.

Although our author laboured with a failing eye and a trembling hand, he was still able to take an interest in public affairs, and to look for a brighter future for his country. The *Coup d'état*, however, of the 2d December 1852, dispelled his fondest illusions. He was obliged to confess that the establishment of the Empire placed it beyond a doubt that there were but few republicans in France; and he had to shed a bitter tear over the extinction of her liberties—over her heroes expatriated, her statesmen imprisoned, and her sages in exile.

The exigencies of the Imperial Government required, as is usual, the allegiance of its functionaries. The constitution which prescribed the oath, had ordained that it should not be administered to a purely scientific body like the Institute; and therefore Arago and his colleagues in the Board of Longitude, including the Director of the Observatory and his assistants, never expected that it would be demanded from them. Their surprise was therefore great when, in the beginning of May 1852, the Board of Longitude was placed in the category of Institutions to which the oath was to be administered. Under ordinary circumstances, and simply as the Director of the Observatory, he might have without a murmur conformed to the new constitution which France had imposed upon itself, but re-collecting his political antecedents, he chose rather to make the sacrifice of office, and to leave his home of forty years, endeared to him by every domestic tie, and every association in science, than to violate the dictates of conscience. In this emergency he addressed to M. Fortoul, the Minister of Public Instruction, the following noble letter, which will ever be remembered in the Annals of science:—

“ PARIS, May 9, 1852.

“ Monsieur le Ministre,—The Government has itself admitted that the oath prescribed by Art. 14 of the Constitution ought not to be required from the members of a purely scientific and literary body like the Institute. I cannot say why the Bureau des Longitudes, an astronomical academy, in which when a vacancy occurs, an election ensues to fill it up, is placed in another category. This simple circumstance would perhaps have sufficed to induce me to refuse the oath, but considerations of another nature, I confess, have exercised a decisive influence on my mind. Circumstances rendered me, in 1848, as member of the Provisional Government, one of the founders of the Republic. As such, and I glory in it at present, I contributed to the abolition of all political oaths. At a later period I was named by the Constituent Assembly President of the Executive Committee; my acts in this last-named situation are too well known to the public for me to have need to mention them here. You can comprehend,

Monsieur le Ministre, that in presence of these reminiscences my conscience has imposed on me a resolution which perhaps the Director of the Observatory would have hesitated to come to. I had always thought that by the terms of the law an astronomer at the Bureau of Longitude, was appointed for life, but your decision has undeceived me. I have, therefore, Monsieur le Ministre, to request you to appoint a day on which I shall have to quit an establishment which I have been inhabiting now for near half a century. That establishment, thanks to the protection given to it by the Governments which have succeeded each other in France for the last forty years—thanks, above all, I may be allowed to say, to the kindness of the Legislative Assemblies in regard to me—has risen from its ruins and its insignificance, and can now be offered to strangers as a model. It is not without a profound sentiment of grief that I shall separate from so many fine instruments, to the construction of which I have more or less contributed; it is not without lively apprehension that I shall behold the means of research created by me passing into malevolent or even hostile hands; but my conscience has spoken, and I am bound to obey its dictates. I am anxious that in this circumstance everything shall pass in the most open manner; and in consequence I hasten to inform you, Monsieur le Ministre, that I will address to all the great academies of Europe and America—for I have long had the honour of belonging to them—a circular to intimate my removal from an establishment with which my name had been in some sort identified, and which was for me a second country. I desire it to be known everywhere that the motives which have dictated my determination have nothing for which my children can ever blush. I owe these explanations above all to the first-rate *savans* who honour me with their friendship, such as Humboldt, Faraday, Brewster, Melloni, &c. I am anxious, also, that these illustrious personages shall not be uneasy concerning the great change which this determination of mine will produce in my existence. My health has without doubt been much impaired in the service of my country. A man cannot have passed a part of his life, going from mountain-peak to mountain-peak, in the wildest districts of Spain, for the purpose of determining the precise figure of the earth; in the inhospitable regions of Africa comprised between Bougia and the capital of the Regency; in Algerine corsairs; in the prisons of Majorca, of Rosas, and Palamos, without profound traces being left behind. But I may remind my friends, that a hand without vigour can still hold a pen, and that the half-blind old man will always find near him persons anxious to note down his words. Receive, Monsieur le Ministre, the assurance of my respect.

“FR. ARAGO.”

When this letter was forwarded to M. Fortoul, a copy of it was at the same time sent to the journals and published in Paris—a step which indicated the conviction on the part of the author that no change could be expected in the resolution of the Prince. He was, however, mistaken. The views and sentiments which it contained were calculated to influence a generous mind, and to such influences the Minister of Public Instruction was far from being insensible. Before accepting of Arago's resignation, he considered it his duty to take the orders of the Prince, who seems instantly to have made an exception in Arago's favour by dispensing with his taking the oath to the Constitution. This noble act, for which we give high credit to the Prince as well as to his Minister, was intimated to Arago in the following letter:—

“Monsieur,—In excusing yourself on May 9, on the score of ill-health, for not attending with your colleagues of the Board of Longitude to take the oath to the Prince President and to the Constitution, you had authorized me to suppose that you would not decline an obligation imposed by the Constitution on all public functionaries. Your second letter, which bears the same date, but which I received at a later hour, does not allow me to entertain that hope. Without stopping to remark on the change of language which it is impossible not to be struck with, and on the terms, so little guarded, which I was surprised to meet with on this occasion from your pen, I considered it my duty to take the orders of the Prince before I accepted your resignation. The President of the Republic has authorized me to admit an exception in favour of a *savant* whose works have thrown lustre on France, and whose existence his Government would regret to embitter. The publicity given to your letters will not change in any respect the resolution which I consider it an honour to transmit to you. Receive, Monsieur, the assurance of my distinguished consideration.

“II. FORTOUL.”

Although the tenure of the Observatory thus granted to its Director, when on his deathbed, was one of short duration, it yet saved him from the mortification and suffering of a removal, and was therefore an act of clemency to be respected even by those who would have preferred to have seen him with the martyr's crown. He was indeed, at this time, given up by the most sanguine of his physicians, and it was the wonder of all his friends how even his robust frame had not given way under the many complications of disease which assailed it. As a last, though a hopeless resource, however, his friends advised him to try the effect of his native air. He accordingly set out for the Eastern Pyrenees

about the end of July 1853, accompanied by his niece, Madame Laugier. But alas! no air however pure,—no exercise however salutary,—no scenery however lovely, possessed the power to heal or to relieve. The elixir of life is not an ingredient of the atmosphere: The alchemist has not found it in his alembic, and the philosopher only in his dreams: If it is ever administered to human infirmities, it must come from the great Physician. Arago returned from the genial breezes of the south, without any new element of health—more infirm indeed than he went, notwithstanding the devoted attention of his niece. When on his way home, Arago went much out of his way in order to pay his respects to the father of M. Flourens, his colleague as perpetual Secretary of the Academy, in order to bring him news of the old man. When they met he had nothing more agreeable to say—“An invalid myself, who am about to die, I have seen your father.” Diabetes, at first not very severe, had rapidly wasted his strength. This was followed with the albuminurie, the disease of Dr. Bright, for which no cure is known, and which so completely destroyed his frame, that at the end of seven months he was reduced to a skeleton. A dropsy in the chest, and swelling of the limbs supervened, and the master disease was not allowed to triumph over one of the strongest of human constitutions. On Saturday the first of October he was visited by his great and distinguished friend Lord Brougham, when he was able to take a large share in the conversation. Arago was much excited by the interview, and Lord Brougham deeply depressed. It is stated by Mr. Barral, that M. Biot had an interview with Arago three hours before his death, when he said to his distinguished colleague, “I intend to resign my situation of Perpetual Secretary to the Academy, since I can no longer discharge its duties.” “If you do,” said Biot, in words that should never be forgotten, “we will all come to you in a body to bring it back to you, and reproach you for your ingratitude.” These noble expressions from one of his worthiest rivals must have been the sweetest anodyne to the dying philosopher. In a few hours, on the 2d October 1852, he breathed his last, at the age of sixty-seven years and seven months.

In his personal appearance Arago was tall and handsome.* The Spanish blood of his ancestors was visible, even in its dilution. His figure was remarkable in its proportions; and when we first saw him in the twenty-eighth year of his age, it was fully developed. His dark penetrating eye did not lose its lustre even among the thick eyebrows which overshadowed it, and revealed a soul full of genius, and a heart instinct with warm

* There is a good engraving of Arago from the portrait by Henry Scheffer, and an excellent bust of him from the chisel of David of Angers.

affection, and inaccessible to every low and illiberal sentiment.

Although Arago had refused his allegiance to the Imperial Government, on the ground of his democratic opinions, the Emperor, with much good taste, decreed to him a public funeral, which took place on the 5th of October, with all the military pomp which is so well understood in Paris. As an Imperial act it, of course, did not gratify the democratic body ; and it was said, that when the *Moniteur* announced in the morning that the Emperor intended to do honour to his illustrious subject, the republican chiefs held a meeting and recommended to their friends not to appear at the funeral. But whether such orders were disobeyed, or never issued, or, if issued, never received, a large mass of the cortege consisted of that party with whom Arago had no sympathy, and who had been in arms against him in the insurrection of June. At eleven o'clock in the morning, the remains of the deceased were transferred to a *chapelle ardente* under the principal gate of the Observatory, where his friends were admitted to the ceremony of sprinkling them with holy water. While this was going on, a brigade of infantry, commanded by General Renaud, who were soon after joined by two hundred men of the National Guard, lined both the sides of the avenue of the Luxembourg. At noon the procession began to move, headed by two companies of infantry, the band playing a solemn dirge. Next came the General with his staff and an escort of horse chasseurs, attired in their uniform of blue and black, with woollen bonnets, which gave them the appearance of Cossacks. Then came two other companies of infantry, the detachment of National Guards, two mourning carriages, containing the clergy of St. Jacques des Haut Pas, a plain hearse, drawn by two horses, and containing the body of the deceased, followed by Emmanuel and Alfred Arago, his two sons, Jacques and Victor Arago, his two brothers, M. Mathieu and M. Laugier, his brother-in-law and nephew, with his other relations and numerous friends. These were followed by the Members of the Institute and a crowd of his political friends, among whom were Garnier Pages, one of his colleagues in the Provisional Government of 1848, M. Pagnerre, one of its secretaries, M. Bastide, minister of foreign affairs under the Government of General Cavaignac, M. Berange, Horace Say, Cousins, Colonel Guinaud of the Parisian artillery, who having joined M. Ledru Rollin in the demonstration of the 13th June 1849, had been sentenced to banishment, but was subsequently pardoned, MM. Lasteurie, Jules Favre, Flandin, and other members of the Legislative Assembly. Two imperial carriages of state followed this band of friends, in which were seated the

representatives of the Government, Marshal Vaillant, grand mareschal of the palace, and M. Ducos, minister of marine, who, in the absence of M. Fortoul, directed, *ad interim*, the bureau of public instruction; the Prince Napoleon was represented by Colonel Desmarets, his first aid-de-camp, and two battalions of infantry terminated the procession. The cortege descended the avenue of the Luxembourg, and passing close to the place where Marshal Ney was shot, proceeded to the Church of St. Jacques des Haut Pas, where, amid the relations and personal friends of the deceased, the funeral service was performed by the parish priest and a numerous body of the clergy.

The cortege resumed its march at one o'clock to the Cemetery of Père la Chaise, where the mortal remains of Arago were deposited, amid the regrets and tears of his friends. The cords of the pall were held by M. Biot, the Father of the Academy; M. Goudchaux, a Minister of the Provisional Government, an Elève of the Polytechnic School, and a Workman. M. Flourens, the distinguished Perpetual Secretary of the Academy for the Physical Sciences, pronounced over his tomb a beautiful and eloquent oration, of which the following are some of the most interesting paragraphs:—

“Death always takes us by surprise. During the last six months a cruel disease ought to have deprived us of every hope of seeing M. Arago again among us; and yet the blow which has struck us has alarmed us as deeply as if it had been unforeseen. It is because the void which certain men leave behind them is greater than even our fears had anticipated, and that we do not discover its extent till it has been made. It is because the intellect which has been extinguished was a powerful intellect, upon which the Academy delighted to lean,—a wonderful intelligence, even to embrace the whole body of science and to extend it, and in which there seems to be realized to some extent the noble mission of our Academy, and even its motto,—*to discover,—to invent,—and to perfect: Invenit et perficit.* . . .

“This is not the place to recount the labours of a scientific life the most active, the most ardent, and the most versatile. M. Arago had the genius of invention. He opened new paths. His discoveries in coloured polarisation, on the relations between magnetism and electricity, and on the magnetism of rotation, are discoveries of a high class, which unveil unknown horizons and found new sciences. Nor was he less skilful or less successful in another line of discovery. M. Arago did not insulate himself in his own success; he panted with the same ardour for the success of the body to which he belonged. He made it a duty to seek out and encourage the young talent which promised new glory to the Academy, and in the career of the sciences there are scarcely any of his contemporaries who have not been attached to him by the ties of gratitude. . . .

“From the moment he appeared at his post of Perpetual Secretary,

a life more active seemed to circulate in the Academy. He knew, by a familiarity always seducing in a superior man, how to gain the confidence, and to conciliate for his purpose the warmest attachment. This gift,—this art of success, he placed wholly at the service of the body of which he was the organ. Never did the action of the Academy appear so powerful,—never did it extend so far. The sciences seemed to throw out a universal lustre, and to diffuse more abundantly their beneficent light over all the productive forces of our country.

“To a penetration unrivalled there was added in Arago an extraordinary talent for analysis. His power of expounding the labours of other men seemed to be but an amusement to his mind. In his functions as Secretary, his quick and easy thought, his spiritual turn, his piquant expressions, fascinated his colleagues, who, always surprised at so many wonderful qualities, listened to him with a pleasure mixed with admiration. . . .

“The noble veterans of science in every part of the civilized world, from Berlin to London, from St. Petersburg to Philadelphia, will sympathize in our grief. Studious generations who have succeeded each other in the last forty years will repeat to the intelligent and patriotic youths who to-day replace them in our brilliant schools, how well he knew to make himself loved, and all the power of the kind sympathy of a master, on whose tomb they have this moment come to lay the homage of their grief.

“This man, in whom were united so many high qualities, spent a part of his life amid the devotion of his family. He had experienced all the sweets of filial piety: the chain of his affections had extended itself without being weakened: his brothers, his sisters, were always at his house as under the paternal roof: his own children and theirs equally belonged to him; and thus he found a daughter* whose pious and touching care ought to receive this day the tribute of the gratitude of the Academy.”

The allusion of M. Flourens to the patriotic youth who had come to express their grief at his tomb, was to the band of young philosophers and heroes from the public schools of the metropolis, who had deputed M. Barral, one of the young friends of Arago, to “address to him their last adieu.” This he did in the following brief and affecting terms:—

“Illustrious master—much loved master—noble citizen—it is a duty, and at the same time a very sad honour, for me to express a sentiment which now fills every heart. Thy constant solicitude for the progress of human knowledge has always induced thee to take the young by the hand, and to inspire them with thy passion for science. On the eve of thy death, the last word which thou spokest to us was, ‘Work—work diligently!’

* Madame Laugier his niece, and the daughter of M. Mathieu. M. Arago had lost his wife, a Roussillaise like himself, the daughter of M. Carrier, Chief Engineer of Roads and Bridges, and remarkable for her personal beauty and accomplishments.

"This sublime lesson will remain engraven on the heart of every young philosopher. They will feel compelled to follow the path which thy genius has opened. In falling asleep into immortality, thou hast desired to teach them that work is the only means of rendering service to their country and to humanity. Thanks on their behalf—Adieu in the name of youth—in the name of its admiration of thee—of its love for thy memory—I tell it thee, and thou mayest count upon it. Adieu!"

Although we are not accustomed in England thus to address the dead, and to laud the departed spirit on its way to the judgment-seat, we may yet appropriate the nobility of the sentiment, and in the hope that England may yet have institutions like France, for rewarding those immortal labours "which render service to their country and to humanity," we may implore the distinguished youth in our own universities and schools to follow the advice of Arago, and to be assured that there can be no reward without labour, no laurel without toil, and no intellectual glory without an intellectual campaign.

At the meeting of the Academy of Sciences, of the 10th October, M. Combes, the President, who had been absent at the last meeting, deplored in a few touching sentences the long and painful disease "which had terminated a life so precious to his colleagues, to his country, and to science."

Arago was among the small number of men who have sacrificed fortune to science; a sacrifice which cannot be deemed a great one by those who, like him, regarded money as of no other use to the philosopher than to enable him to pursue his researches free from professional anxieties and pecuniary difficulties. His habits were simple and frugal; and his income, never we believe reaching £500 a year, was not more than was required to educate his family in Paris. Vice-Admiral Baudin, the President of the Board of Longitude, informs us, "That during the four months in which he held the portfolio of the Marine, M. Arago, in the face of the embarrassments at the Treasury, abstained from touching his salary as Minister, desiring that his services in these difficult circumstances should be purely gratuitous."

In the same liberal spirit, when he was appointed Perpetual Secretary, he resigned his professorship in the Polytechnic School, to avoid the charge of being a pluralist. As Director of the Observatory, he never would accept any other allowance than that of an ordinary member of the Board of Longitude. When disease had incapacitated him from the usual discharge of his duties in the Secretaryship of the Academy, he tormented himself with the idea that he ought not to accept a salary for which he had not given value, and was thus led to the proposal of resigning the office to which we have already referred.

The religious condition of great men—of sages almost divine, whom God has chosen to unfold the mysteries of his universe, and to whom he has, for this purpose, given a portion of his own bright intelligence,—is a topic too tender for the world's gaze; too deep for the world's scrutiny. We doubtless admire, and perchance envy, the humble inquirer who has been startled by no difficulties of faith, and receives in meekness the revelation from on high; but let us not prejudice the bolder, and perhaps more anxious mind, who has not ventured to embalm his faith in a religious profession, or to announce it as a peace-offering to society. The philosopher who has surmounted intellectual difficulties by his genius, may succeed in mastering more mystic truths, and we know not at what hour of a failing life, or during which of the last pulses of the departing spirit, the great truth may be revealed and accepted. In the writings of Arago these subjects have not been presented to our notice, and we should not have referred to them here but for a painful anecdote which has been published by M. De la Rive.*

Having thus given our readers a brief sketch of the life and character of Arago, we shall now proceed to offer them a condensed account of those great discoveries in science, which have placed his name in the honorary lists of all the great Academies in the Old and the New Worlds. The most important, doubtless, of all his discoveries are those which relate to the polarisation and diffraction of light. In the middle of the 17th century, a Danish philosopher, Bartholinus, had discovered a transparent mineral called Iceland spar, which had the remarkable property of giving two images of everything, or of refracting a single pencil of light into two pencils—a property now well known under the name of the double refraction of light. Huygens, the distinguished Dutch philosopher, discovered that one of these pencils had dif-

* This anecdote has been published more than once, and commented on in a way we should not have expected. Our readers may desire to peruse it. It forms the concluding paragraph of the third brief notice of M. Arago in our list. "We were conversing on the wonders of creation—on the great question of the formation of worlds. The name of God came naturally to be used. This led him to complain of the difficulty which his intelligence experienced in comprehending God: one saw clearly the struggle which passed in his mind with regard to truths which are often more felt than demonstrated by the help of pure reason. 'But,' said I, 'it is yet more difficult not to comprehend God than to comprehend Him.' He did not deny this; but only added, 'In this case I abstain, for it is impossible for me to comprehend rightly the God of you philosophers.' 'But it is not of Him we are now talking,' I replied, 'though I am of opinion that true philosophy conducts necessarily to the notion of God. It is of the God of the Christians that I meant to speak.' 'Ah!' said he to me, 'it is the God of my mother, before whom she always found so much comfort in kneeling.' 'Without doubt,' said I. He added no more. His heart had spoken. This time he had understood." We must leave our reader to form his own judgment on the import and moral of this conversation.

ferent properties from the other, and also from the original pencil, of which they were the halves, or from any other pencil of exactly the same size that had not passed through the spar. He had, in short, discovered that the two pencils formed by the spar were pencils of *polarized* light, as they were afterwards called; but it was left to Newton, who knew much less of the subject than Huygona, to remark that the sides of the two pencils had acquired different properties in passing through the spar.

This interesting truth, though well known to every philosopher in Europe, slumbered for more than a century, till 1810, when it burst forth in a new form, the germ of new arts, and the principle of new sciences. When Malus, a celebrated French philosopher, was viewing through a piece of Iceland spar the light of the setting sun reflected from one of the windows of the Luxembourg, he found that the pencil of light thus reflected had acquired *by reflexion* the same properties as if it had been one of the two pencils refracted by Iceland spar. Thus he was led to the great truth, *that a ray of common light reflected at a certain angle, differing with the nature of the body whether solid or fluid, is polarized*, or has the same property as one of the rays produced by the double refraction of Iceland spar.

This discovery was followed by others which we owe to Malus and other philosophers; but in none of the new observations thus made were any phenomena of colour observed. The discovery of *coloured polarisation* was reserved for Arago, and formed the basis of those numerous and splendid researches which have been made in every part of Europe. On the 11th August 1811, Arago communicated to the Academy of Sciences a paper "On a particular modification which the luminous rays experience on their passage through certain transparent bodies." In transmitting polarized light through thin plates of sulphate of lime, mica, and rock crystal, and subsequently analyzing them with a prism of calcareous spar, made so as to separate distinctly the two images, the most beautiful complementary colours were produced, the colour of one of the images being complementary to that of the other. These colours varied with the thickness of the plate, which he sometimes reduced to such a degree of thinness that it had not the power of producing colours at all. Though in the same plate the colours varied with the thickness, yet there were other causes on which they depended. When the transparent plate was turned round, Arago found that there were two positions of the plate at right angles to one another, in which the crystal gave no colours, while they appeared in all intermediate positions.*

* The phenomena of coloured polarisation were discovered, by independent observation, by Sir David Brewster, and exhibited to the Royal Society of Edin-

These fundamental observations attracted the notice and admiration of other Members of the Institute, and M. Biot, with his usual diligence and ardour, and the use of fine apparatus given him by the Academy, added to them a series of brilliant discoveries. Though occupied with his duties in the Observatory, M. Arago continued his optical researches. In his experiments with quartz he had observed along the axis of the crystal certain colours which, though they increased and diminished with the thickness of the plate, he considered as differing in their nature from the ordinary polarized tints. These tints were the same as those subsequently discovered in many fluids by Seebeck and Biot, which have been so beautifully analyzed by the latter, and made the basis of a series of researches as important to the sciences as they have been useful in the arts.

Among the most interesting optical discoveries of M. Arago, we must enumerate those on the interference of common and polarized light. The shadows of all bodies in light proceeding from a point or narrow aperture are surrounded with several coloured fringes, produced by what is called *diffraction*, and in the shadows themselves there are other fringes parallel, generally speaking, to the former. Our celebrated countryman, Dr. Thomas Young, proved, that these inner fringes disappeared when the light on one side of the body was intercepted, thus establishing, that they were produced by the interference of the rays that passed by one side with those that passed by the other. M. Arago made one of the greatest discoveries on this subject, by shewing that when the light was intercepted by a transparent plate, the fringes were displaced by a quantity depending on the refractive power and thickness of the plate. Hence, he was led to many fine results—for example, to the determination that the index of refraction from a vacuum into dry air was

1.0002945,

and from a vacuum into air saturated with humidity

1.0002936.

The experiment of displacement has, however, led to still greater results. M. Delarive has maintained that the experiment proves that the displaced ray was retarded in its passage through the transparent plate, and, consequently, that the Newtonian theory of emission was false. The experiment proves nothing more than the displacement; and though Arago had devised, for many years, an experiment for proving that light moved slower in transparent bodies than in air, it was not till Leon Foucault, under his directions, completed the fine experiment which we have ourselves seen, from which he has drawn

burgh, when no knowledge of M. Arago's observations existed in Scotland, owing to the interrupted communication between France and England. The priority of discovery, however, belongs distinctly to M. Arago.

the conclusion *that light moves with less velocity in water than in air*, and, consequently, that he has *experimentally demonstrated the truth of the undulatory theory, and the falsehood of the Newtonian*.

In various notices of the discoveries of Arago, where this last experiment is adduced to prove not only a truth but a theory, it is stated that English writers make the two theories a question of *patriotism*, and that "Sir David Brewster and Lord Brougham are emissionists." These persons might have eliminated *patriotism* from the list of emissionist arguments, had they added, which they might have done, with equal, if not with much more truth, that M. Biot, without exception the most profound and accomplished optical philosopher of the day, *is an emissionist*. These three individuals deny what is thus intended to be an aspersion upon them. M. Biot wittily said to Lord Brougham, in reference to these charges, that he is a "*rieniste*," waiting doubtless, like his colleagues in the Institute, for that effulgent light which has not yet burst upon them either from Cambridge or from Paris. Sir David Brewster has long ago declared that the emission theory is incapable of explaining very many optical phenomena which the undulatory theory readily explains, and has expressed his highest admiration of the latter as a mathematical theory. We believe that we may venture to add, that this is the opinion both of Lord Brougham and Biot; but when we are called upon by persons in Cambridge, who have scarcely ever made an experiment on the subject, and have been more recently called upon by writers in Paris, who have not made many more, to surrender our judgments, and give in our allegiance to a great speculation, we can only express our wonder at the intolerance of the age. M. Arago himself never even asserted that the undulatory theory was *demonstrated* by his own early experiments and those of Fresnel. He for twelve years looked forward to the experiment of Foucault as a *confirmation* of his views; and were he alive, he would tell us, with his usual candour, that something more is wanting to make the prevailing theory of light a theory of universal and necessary faith. Even M. l'Abbé Moigno, who has, more than any living writer, denounced the just caution of men who are entitled to be cautious,—even he who has seen, as we also have done, the grand experiment of Foucault, and given the best account of it, makes the remark, "that the experimental researches of MM. Fizeau and Foucault are an *evident confirmation of the theory of undulations*!" We agree with the Abbé in the justice of the sentiment, but we will not believe that these researches are a *demonstration* ~~of it~~, on the authority even of a bull, however loudly fulminated in any of the intellectual vaticans of Europe.*

* Some of our readers may not know that Sir Isaac Newton in his discourse on

No less interesting than the experiments we have mentioned are those of Arago on the interference of polarized rays. In conjunction with Fresnel he shewed that two pencils of light polarized in the same plane interfere with one another exactly like pencils of common light; 2d, That two pencils whose planes of polarisation form an acute angle with one another interfere only partially, the intensity of the fringes being greatly diminished; 3d, That rays polarized at right angles to each other do not interfere at all; 4th, That such rays may be brought into the same plane of polarisation without interference; and, 5th, That two rays polarized at right angles to one another and brought into the same plane of polarisation, interfere only when they belong to a pencil originally and entirely polarized in one plane; and, 6th, That in the interference of doubly refracted pencils we must, besides the difference of paths, take into account half an undulation, which has as it were been lost. These great results threw a broad light upon the whole phenomena of chromatic polarisation, and overturned the very ingenious theory of moveable polarisation which Biot had invented for explaining this class of phenomena.

The discoveries of Arago on the subject of what has been called optical meteorology are of peculiar interest. His discovery of a Neutral point in the atmosphere where there is no polarisation,—his observations on the polarisation of halos, and his polarimeter for measuring degrees of polarisation,—his anticipation of the polarisation dial—his cyanometer for measuring the blue colour of the sky, are a few of the topics which want of space only prevents us from describing more fully.

Passing over, as we must do, his fine researches on the subject of Newton's coloured rings, as produced in polarized light, and published in the *Mémoires D'Arcueil*,—his profound investigations on the subject of photometry, his experimental verification of the formulæ of Fresnel, and many other researches and inventions which it would require a volume to explain, we must draw the attention of our readers to his important discoveries on the subject of magnetism.

The general prevalence of magnetism in substances not ferruginous had been for some time a subject of experimental research, but it is to Arago that we owe the discovery of the universal prevalence of magnetism in bodies. On the 20th Nov. 1844, he communicated to the Academy of Sciences his discovery of the magnetic

colours, read to the Royal Society in 1875, proposes a theory of light in which the principles of the emission and undulation theory are combined. With that theory, which we do not adopt, the great experiment of Foucault is not at variance.

properties of substances not containing iron. Having conceived the idea of studying the oscillations of a magnetic needle when placed above or in the presence of any body, he suspended a magnetic needle above a surface of metal or of water. When made to deviate a certain number of degrees from its position, it began, when left to itself, to oscillate in arcs of loss and less amplitude, as if it had been placed in a resisting medium; and, what was peculiarly interesting, the diminution of the amplitude of the oscillations did not alter the number of oscillations executed in a given time. Thus when the semi-amplitude of the oscillations of the needle was 43° , and the needle was placed upon *water*, the oscillation lost 10° in amplitude after 30 oscillations when the distance of the needle from the water was 63 millimètres, whereas at a distance of 52·2 millimètres it required 60 oscillations to produce a loss of 10° of amplitude.

When the same needle was placed upon *Ice*, the following were the results:—

Distance of needle from ice.	Diminution of amplitude.	No. of oscillations to pro- duce the diminution.
0·70 Millim.	From 53° to 43° .	26
52·50 ...	From 53° to 43° .	60
When <i>Crown glass</i> was used.		
0·91 Millim.	From 90° to 41° .	122
4·01 ...	From 90° to 41° .	221

When the needle was placed upon plates of metal, similar results were obtained; but the metals that acted more energetically than glass, wood, &c., exhibited a mode of action different from these substances. Hence it follows that all bodies placed near a magnetic needle in a state of oscillation, exercise over it such an action as to diminish the amplitude without altering the number of its oscillations, and hence the universal prevalence of magnetism in bodies is established. Dr. Seebeck of Berlin upon repeating these experiments found that in alloying magnetic with non-magnetic bodies, he could form compounds which *exercised no action upon the needle*. The alloys which specially possessed this remarkable property were those consisting of five parts of antimony and one of iron, or two parts of copper with one of nickel. At its anniversary meeting in 1825, the Royal Society of London adjudged the Copley Medal to M. Arago for ~~this~~ discovery.

While occupied in these researches, the idea presented itself to our author that the magnetic needle while under the influence of a glass or metal plate, might be carried round or in some way

affected by the rotation of the plate. In order to perform this experiment, an apparatus, consisting chiefly of a clock made of copper with the exception of two or three steel pivots, was constructed for the purpose of giving a motion of rotation to the plate laid horizontally on the top of a vertical revolving axis. Immediately above this was placed a glass receiver, within which the needle was suspended so as to take its place horizontally within a short distance of the revolving plate.

When the apparatus was prepared, and the copper made to revolve under the needle in its place, with a sheet of paper intervening to prevent disturbance from aerial currents, the needle was gradually drawn out of the magnetic meridian with a force proportional to the velocity of the copper plate, and as this new force is opposed by the magnetic action of the earth, which constantly tends to keep the needle in its place, the needle must finally take a position of equilibrium depending on the ratio of these forces. In very rapid rotations, however, the inferior influence of the earth is completely overpowered, and the needle turns continually round. In such cases the needle will take a fixed position by increasing its distance from the revolving plate, the velocity remaining the same, so that the deviation of the needle may be made very small by increasing that distance.

In studying the influence of plates of various metals, Arago found the results so dependent on the purity of the materials, that he did not publish them, but limited his attention chiefly to the determination of the components of the force developed by rotation, in the direction of three lines parallel to three co-ordinate planes perpendicular to each other. The component perpendicular to the revolving plate, he found to be a repulsive one by its action on a long magnet, suspended vertically by a thread to the extremity of the arm of a balance in equilibrium with a weight at the other extremity. When the plate revolves the magnet is repelled, and the equilibrium of the balance overset. The second component is horizontal and perpendicular to a vertical plane abutting against the projection of the pole of the needle. This is the force which, acting in the direction of a tangent to the axis, produces the rotation of the needle. The third component is parallel to the radius which abuts against the projection of the pole of the needle. It may be determined by a dipping needle placed vertically, so that its axis of rotation is continued in a plane perpendicular to one of the radii of the disc. No action is experienced by a similar needle placed at the centre of the disc. There was also a second point nearer the margin than the centre, where no change was produced by the disc on the position of the needle; but between these neutral points the lower pole is constantly attracted towards the centre

of the disc, while beyond that point it is repelled. These experiments were announced to the Academy of Sciences on the 7th March 1825; and they were exhibited in London in the following April by M. Gay Lussac. They excited great interest throughout Europe. Messrs. Babbage and Herschel, Barlow, Nobili, Christie, and Messrs. Prevost and Colladon took up the subject and obtained many important results.

In consequence of M. Arago having discovered in 1820, contemporaneously, we believe, with Sir H. Davy and Dr. Seebeck, the power of the electric current to impart magnetism to iron and steel needles, his friends have claimed for him a share in the discovery of the Electric Telegraph. We have not seen sufficient evidence, nor do we believe that any exists, to place the name of any single person in the history of science, as the discoverer of the Electric Telegraph. Although so much has been done by individuals, both as discoverers of principles and inventors of methods, yet we are not aware of any person having claimed for himself the invention of this noble apparatus. If, however, we are to give the invention of the steam engine and steam vessels to Papin, Hull, and others, who originally suggested the idea, we can have no hesitation in assigning the invention of the Electric Telegraph to a humble Scotsman who has left us only the shadow of his name. Just *one hundred years ago*, a contributor to the Scotch Magazine, dating from Renfrew, published to the world the invention of the Electric Telegraph, in terms so distinct that they must take away from every claimant any other merit than that of simplifying it, and employing the known principles of electricity and magnetism, discovered since the time of its inventor. Although this is not the place to discuss the history of that invention, we shall give our readers the gratification of reading this remarkable production.*

* *Renfrew, Feb. 1, 1753.*

"SIR.—It is well known to all who are conversant in electrical experiments, that the electric power may be propagated along a small wire, from one place to another, without being sensibly abated by the length of its progress. Let then a set of wires, equal in number to the letters of the alphabet, be extended horizontally between two given places, parallel to one another, and each of them about an inch distant from that next to it. At every twenty yards end, let them be fixed in glass, or jeweller's cement, to some firm body, both to prevent them from touching the earth, or any other non-electric, and from breaking by their own gravity. Let the electric gun-barrel be placed at right angles with the extremities of the wires, and about an inch below them. Also let the wires be fixed in a solid piece of glass, at six inches from the end; and let that part of them which reaches from the glass to the machine, have sufficient spring and stiffness to recover its situation after having been brought in contact with this barrel. Close by the supporting glass, let a ball be suspended from every wire: and about a sixth or an eighth of an inch below the ball, place the letters of an alphabet, marked on bits of paper, or any other substance that may be light enough to rise to the electrified ball; and

Among the interesting inquiries of Arago relating to magnetism, we cannot omit his views respecting what has been called by Humboldt *magnetic storms* or disturbances in the magnetic atmosphere, extending themselves to great distances in our atmosphere, exhibiting themselves in irregular movements of the magnetic needle, and terminating in a display of the aurora borealis. In *electrical storms*, on the other hand, the disturbances have a limited range, terminating in thunder, and lightning, and rain.

When the construction and safety of steam boilers had become objects of national importance, Arago and Dulong were, in 1820,

at the same time let it be so contrived that each of them may reassume its proper place when dropt. All things constructed as above, and the minute previously fixed, I begin the conversation with my distant friend in this manner. Having set the electrical machine a-going as in ordinary experiments, suppose I am to pronounce the word *Sir*; with a piece of glass, or any other *electric per se*, I strike the wire *S*, so as to bring it in contact with the barrel, then *i*, then *r*, all in the same way: and my correspondent almost in the same instant observes these several characters rise, in order, to the electric balls at his end of the wires. Thus I spell away as long as I think fit; and my correspondent, for the sake of memory, writes the characters as they rise, and may join and read them afterwards as often as he inclines. Upon a signal given, or from choice, I stop the machine; and taking up the pen in my turn, I write down whatever my friend at the other end strikes out.

"If any body should think this way tiresome, let him, instead of the balls, suspend a range of bells from the roof, equal in number to the letters of the alphabet; gradually decreasing in size from the bell *A* to *Z*: and from the horizontal wires, let there be another set reaching to the several bells; one, viz from the horizontal wire *A* to the bell *A*, another from the horizontal wire *B* to the bell *B*, &c. Then let him who begins the discourse bring the wires in contact with the barrel, as before; and the electric spark breaking on the bells of different size, will inform his correspondent by the sound what wires have been touched. And then, by some practice, they may come to understand the language of the chimes in *whole words*, without being put to the trouble of writing down every letter.

"The same thing may be otherwise effected. Let the balls be suspended over the characters as before, but instead of bringing the ends of the horizontal wires in contact with the barrel, let a second set reach from the electrified wire, so as to be in contact with the horizontal ones; and let it be so contrived at the same time, that any of them may be removed from its corresponding horizontal by the slightest touch, and may bring itself again into contact, when left at liberty. This may be done by the help of a small spring and slider, or twenty other materials, which the least ingenuity will discover. In this way the characters will always adhere to the balls, excepting when any of the secondaries is removed from contact with its horizontal; and then the letter at the other end of the horizontal will immediately drop from its ball. But I mention this only by way of variety.

"Some may perhaps think, that although this electric fire has not been observed to diminish, sensibly, in its progress through any length of wire that has been tried hitherto; yet as that has never exceeded some thirty or forty yards, it may be reasonably supposed, that in a far greater length, it would be remarkably diminished, and probably would be entirely drained off in a few miles by the surrounding air. To prevent the objection, and some longer argument, lay over the wires from one end to the other with a thin coat of jeweller's cement. This may be done for a trifle of additional expense; and as it is an *electric per se*, will effectually secure any part of the fire from mixing with the atmosphere.—I am, &c. C. M."—*The Scots Magazine*, Feb. 1753, vol. xv. pp. 73, 74.

employed by the Government to make experiments on the subject, and they drew up tables exhibiting the elastic forces of steam at different temperatures. This task, which was executed with much ability, was as dangerous as it was difficult. The bursting of boilers to which they were constantly exposed, and that too in a limited locality, was more hazardous than that of shells in a field of battle; and while military officers who assisted them—men of tried courage—grew pale and fled from the scene, the two savans went on coolly making their calculations, and observing the temperature and pressure with boilers every moment on the point of explosion.*

Numerous and valuable as are the scientific researches of Arago, of which he has himself given an account, yet we should form an imperfect estimate either of his genius or of his labours were we to measure them by his published writings. In early life, when fame is the lofty stimulus to genius, the young philosopher is little scrupulous about the form or manner in which he presents his achievements to the world. To gain the victory—to announce it to the world, and to receive the laurel, are the sole objects of his desire. If he has competitors in the race of ambition who carry less weight than himself, and who have more leisure and greater instrumental resources, he is compelled to work under a higher mental pressure, and by prematurely disclosing his discoveries, to enable his rival to occupy the very heights at which he aimed. Time, however, soon reduces this morbid aspiration after fame, and we believe there are few successful discoverers who have not withheld from the public large portions of their researches, in the hope, frequently a vain one, of finding leisure to correct and extend them. If Arago had not published so early his paper on chromatic polarisation, he might have anticipated Biot in many of his great discoveries; but, on the other hand, he ran the risk of losing the priority which he possessed, unless he had couched his results in an anagram, or lodged them in a sealed packet with the Academy.

It is doubtless, from causes of this nature, that Arago has left behind him so many unpublished memoirs, and so many undescribed inventions and discoveries. When, in 1850, he himself made this announcement to the Academy, it was in terms, and under circumstances, which deeply affected his colleagues and his audience. "The bad state of my health," he said, "and the great change which my sight has almost suddenly experienced, have inspired me with the desire, I may almost say, have imposed upon me the duty, of promptly giving to the public the scientific results which I have obtained, and which, for a long

* Notices on this subject will be found in the *Annuaire* for 1829 and 1830.

time have slumbered in my manuscripts. I have resolved to commence with Photometry, a science which, born in the middle of our Academy, has remained stationary amidst the progress which has been made in optics during the last half century. In publishing the results of researches pursued interruptedly for many long years, and with instruments improved or invented by myself, it appears to me that my communications should not bear upon insulated facts, but should rather embrace general results mutually connected, so as to form each a chapter in science." With these preliminary observations, our great philosopher entered upon the subject of his memoirs, and at successive sittings of the Academy, he continued week after week, —without the aid of diagrams or instruments,—without looking into his MSS.,—without consulting even a memorandum,—to describe in detail long series of experiments and calculations, and to expound those great physical truths to which they led. These memoirs we are happy to announce will speedily be given to the world. M. Gide, the celebrated publisher of the *Travels and Cosmos of Humboldt*, has given 120,000 francs, about £5000, for the copyright of Arago's works, printed and in MS. They will be published in *twelve* volumes octavo. *Three* volumes will embrace his historical ologes and biographical notices, preceded by *Memoirs of his youth*. *Two* volumes will be occupied with *nineteen* scientific memoirs, of which only *six* or *seven* have been published. *Two* volumes will form a treatise on physical astronomy, a work of which the highest expectations have been formed. Other *three* volumes will comprehend the scientific notices which have appeared in the *Annales*, including a new edition of the remarkable one on Thunder, which Arago had prepared on his deathbed. The *last* volume will contain reports made to the different legislative assemblies on the subject of fortifications and other public works. M. Barral, formerly a pupil of the Polytechnic School, and Professor of Chemistry, has undertaken the duty of editing the works of his friend, and there is reason to believe that they will very soon be in the possession of the public.

Although these volumes will form the true monument to the memory of their distinguished author, yet the friends of Arago have, with great propriety, resolved to erect, in honour of him, a more public memorial. We trust that this will neither be a marble bust in the Institute, which private friends may supply, nor a colossal figure in bronze, nor a sepulchral column over his ashes, but a noble building erected in the heart of Paris, at whose base the youth of France may kneel, or within whose precincts they may imbibe those ennobling sentiments, or study those immortal truths which will ever be associated with his name.

It is difficult to draw in a few definite lines the character of a man like Arago, presented to us as it is under so many phases, and viewed from so many points of sight. A child of the first revolution—a stripling during the consulate and military sway of Napoleon—a public teacher under the restoration—a legislator under the unconstitutional regime of Louis Philippe—a cabinet minister under the provisional government—a deputy under the second republic—and a dying man under the second empire,—we find him carried, a patriot, to his grave by the representatives of all the conflicting opinions, and all the antagonist authorities of his country. Through what dangerous quicksands must such a course have lain? How many Charybdises must the pilgrim have crossed, and how many Scyllas evaded in so stormy a passage to the grave? It would be difficult to delineate in its noble outline and godlike form the character of a patriot and a philanthropist, two inseparable names;—but that statesman is, doubtless, deserving of the double title who has lived simply and died in poverty—who has refused salaries that he had earned, and emoluments that he had won, and who has spent his life in developing the only true sources of national greatness and social regeneration—the education of the commonwealth—the advancement of science, literature, and the arts—the simplification of knowledge, and the diffusion of it among all classes of the people. In this its highest meaning Arago was a statesman, and one of that honoured group whose destiny it has been to take an efficient part in these various branches of their country's service. But in thus serving his country, he became the benefactor of the human family. Every step in the patriot's career, though primarily taken for his country, is ultimately taken for mankind. The lesson which is taught, and the example which is set on the Seine or on the Thames, will be learned and imitated on the Mississippi, and on the Volga. The law of truth and justice which triumphs over European anarchy, will yet tame the ferocious Tartar, and fix the wandering Arab.

It is, however, in his character as a philosopher and as a Perpetual Secretary of the Institute that Arago is best known and most appreciated in England. He was personally acquainted with the greater number of our distinguished men, and received as a foreign member into almost all our Societies. His genius—his talents—his discoveries—his manly character—his high estimate of intellectual worth, were universally admired, and if we ever heard a sound not in unison with the language of praise, it was but the expression of regret that so distinguished a philosopher should have been exposed to the political convulsions which had been so long desolating his country.

As an editor of the *Annales de Chimie et de Physique* and of

the *Comptes Rendus*, &c.,* Arago was specially called upon to decide in cases of disputed inventions and discoveries. We all know how complicated such questions become when discussed under the influence of national and personal feeling, and we have seen how these feelings have operated in the history of Fluxions and in the recent controversies respecting the discovery of Neptune. Arago has been rashly accused of always leaning to his country; but though we do not concur in some of his decisions, nor admit the rules which some of his countrymen have laid down as the basis of such adjudications, we yet regard his decisions as the convictions of an upright man, subject, like every other judge, to the influences around him. How different is the conduct of some of our own self-constituted arbiters of science, who, with no country in their heart, have, under the impulse of an ignoble personality, transferred to foreign claimants discoveries which have been made at home.

One of the brightest phases in the character of Arago was his ardent love of science,—his admiration of those who advanced it,—his zeal to encourage youthful genius, and to patronize the ingenuity and inventions of the humblest artisan. In the name of the youth and the workmen of Paris, M. Barral has expressed the affection and gratitude which they owe him. M. Flourens has recorded in eloquent terms the sentiments of the Academy which he adorned; and the veterans of science who have mourned his loss in the different capitals of the civilized world, will doubtless join in the glowing sentiments of the chief whom they honour,—the illustrious Baron Humboldt, the father of the republic of science:—"But that," says he, "which characterized this singular man was not only the fire of genius which produced, and the penetration which enabled him to develop new creations as things that had been long achieved by human intelligence;—it was the attractive union of the energy and elevation of an impassioned character, with the most affectionate gentleness of disposition. I am proud to think that, by my tender devotions and my respectful admiration, I have belonged to him during forty-four years;—that my name will be sometimes pronounced beside his great name;—and that all my works bear testimony to my gratitude and warm affection."

After such expressions of admiration and friendship from authorities so high, we should scarcely have ventured to add a few words of our own, had we not been placed toward Arago in a relation very different from theirs. Forty years have elapsed since the writer of these lines became acquainted with Arago,

* *Comptes Rendus hebdomadaires des Séances de L'Académie.* Par MM. les Secrétaires Perpétuels, 1835-1854.

when engaged in the same inquiries with himself. The tie created by similarity of studies, though at first strong, is often one which is most easily severed. Whether in the pursuit of fame we outstrip our friend, or are left behind in the race, we reach the goal with some disturbance in the affections. The silver cord, though neither enfeebled nor broken, may yet have given forth a discordant sound. That man indeed can have no feeling for his mission who does not vindicate a right of discovery with all the energy which truth and justice demand, and hence it is that, under peculiar circumstances, men of ardent temperament have permitted such discussions to cool down the general flow of the affections. Time, however, never fails to thaw the current that has been only frozen; and rival philosophers soon learn to leave to posterity the settlement of their claims, and to entrust to it the correction even of contemporary injustice. We have had the good fortune, as we now feel it, of breaking a lance with Arago, both as a principal and a second, in some of the tournaments of science. A nobler and more generous opponent we never encountered. When after a campaign of twenty-five years it became necessary that we should meet, he prepared the way by a letter of lofty sentiment and warm affection. Other twenty years have elapsed, in which we have found ourselves in open combat with him on questions of exciting interest and national feeling; but he has ever shewn to us the warmest friendship, not only in words which he has addressed to the world, but in acts of substantial and much valued kindness. It is therefore with the deepest sorrow that we mourn the double loss of a friend and of a sage, and that we now express over his tomb our admiration of his genius, our sympathy with his patriotism, our gratitude for his kindness, and our affection for his character.

We could have wished to have here closed our account of M. Arago; but an attack has been made upon him in England by one of our most respectable Journals, so violent in its character, so false in its statements, and so vicious in the motives which have inspired it, that we owe it to the scientific character of our country to disavow it as the production of any English philosopher. Although the title of the article is, *The Institute of France*, a subject not very interesting to the readers of the *Quarterly Review*, yet that title is assumed in order to introduce an account of the Academy of Sciences, and thus gain a position from which to throw dishonour on its Perpetual Secretary. Had the writer of this tirade subjected to criticism any of the works of Arago, or questioned the originality or value of any of his discoveries, or had he been led in political discussion to

challenge his patriotism or denounce his republicanism, we should have been the last to interfere even with the licentiousness of literary criticism, or the virulence of political slander. But the article to which we refer is an attack upon the entire life and character and motives of a great man,—dictated by personal resentment,—pretending to instruct the public when its object is to wound the individual,—and masking under the incense of praise the poison of its stiletto.

The attack upon the Institute as a body will no doubt be repelled by an elaborate exposure of its falsehoods. It is with the charges against the Academy of Sciences and M. Arago that we shall deal. This distinguished body is charged “with adopting in the present day new methods to gain an ascendancy over the public!” It is described as an inferior body to the Academy under Lagrange and Laplace,—as unjustly boasting of the superiority of its mathematicians,—as having lost its pre-eminence in Europe, and as addressing itself to the populace, and winning their sympathy by the tone of its periodicals. The older members, Biot, Thenard, Cauchy, Mirbel, Arago, and Chevreul, are set down as belonging to another age; and Dumas, Elie de Beaumont, and Leverrier, the younger members, are denounced as “more devoted to politics than to physics.”

This change of character is ascribed to the admission of the public to its meetings, which is considered as no less a revolution than that of the State in 1830! Profound discussions are now said to have disappeared, and the Academicians seek only the favour of the crowd. The *Comptes Rendus*, the noblest scientific journal in the world, is said to have been established “as a great instrument of domination,” and to be often filled with worthless communications. M. Arago is declared to be “the promoter of this revolution.” He is charged with ignorance of mathematics and of classical learning;—with seeking for an easily won applause in the exposition of popular science;—with exhibiting an intolerance without bounds when a republican;—with leaguering himself with the ultra-liberal party;—with addressing himself to false and vulgar patriotism;—with claiming all discoveries for Frenchmen;—with preferring the productions of an ouvrier to those of a philosopher;—with setting aside in the Academy important discoveries to announce showers of frogs to please “a gaping crowd;” and with “pulling down the pillars of the Temple of Science to make sport for the Philistines.” Out of “a thousand of examples” of virulent discussions, in which the “rigour of philosophical disputation is exchanged for the heated declamation of popular demagogues,” the critic gives one of a very gentle character *on the authority of a Havre newspaper*. M. Arago is next charged with voting for that distinguished natural-

ist, Charles Bonaparte, as a candidate for the Academy, in opposition to M. Delcassert. The patronage of the numerous professorships possessed by the Academy is said to be so abused, that combinations are made in order that the success of an election may sooner or later result in some advantage to the elector or his friend. M. Arago is next attacked for having obtained large grants for the Observatory, and yet for neglecting the duties which he owes it. He is especially charged with the crime of not having discovered any of the *twenty-seven little planets*; and the critic "*safely predicts that when Arago turns politics out of the door, the planets will begin to peep in at the window*," as if he did not know that *none of these planets* have been discovered at Greenwich, Edinburgh, Dublin, Cambridge, Oxford, Copenhagen, Altona, Dorpat, Pulkova, just because these great observatories have a very different kind of work to perform. Even the leviathan telescope of Lord Rosse declines to push out its gridiron tongue to feed upon the small fry of Asteroids. But not only did Arago neglect little planets;—he treated magnificent comets as disrespectfully! "While the argus of the Paris observatory was asleep, the idle promenader on the *Boulevards des Italiens* detected one evening a magnificent comet, which was not seen by *astronomer Arago* and his assistants till the following night!"

Such is the attack upon a great man which has been fulminated for the instruction of English conservatives,—an attack written and issued when Arago was lying blind on his deathbed, and unable to put forth the paw of the lion to crush his antagonist. Arago died on the very day, we believe, of the publication of the Review, as if the intellectual Upas had sent its poison by telegraph to carry off its victim.

To some of the copies of the Review there was appended a slip of paper expressing the hypocritical regret that the state of Arago's health was not known to the author. The apology, if it is meant as one, is false. All the world knew that Arago had been blind and dying for the last two years, disappointing week after week the fears of his physicians, and labouring with decaying life, to prepare an intellectual legacy to posterity.

We have asked ourselves the question, Could any English philosopher have composed the extraordinary production which we have been condemning? We answer, impossible—impossible even if there exists a philosopher whom Arago's influence has excluded from being a member of the Academy. We have asked ourselves another question: Can it be written by a Frenchman? and we answer, equally impossible, unless by some deadly royalist whom Arago may have had a share in driving from the Republic.

ART. VIII.—*Cybele Britannica; or British Plants, and their Geographical Relations.* By HEWETT COTTRELL WATSON. In three volumes octavo. London, 1847-1852.

IF we duly consider the peculiar characters of Natural History, whether viewed as an efficient mental training, an amusing study, or, as powerfully aiding the progress of the arts of life, we must join ourselves to those who lament that it does not occupy its true place as a branch of general education. Indeed we fear that many of our readers would feel themselves in no ordinary degree puzzled to give an intelligible reply to the question, "What is Natural History?" Those who have devoted their attention to the subject, and who are qualified to give a trustworthy opinion regarding it, would readily reply—the object of Natural History is to determine the appearances, relations, and functions of the beings constituting the Inorganic and Organized Kingdoms—and be disposed to recommend the substitution of the more appropriate phrase, "NATURAL SCIENCE." According to this view, we may regard Natural History as occupied with, or embracing the four following branches of knowledge, viz. in the inorganic kingdom, mineralogy and geology, and in the organized kingdom, phytology (or botany) and zoology. But while these are the views usually entertained by intelligent naturalists, we fear that less distinct notions prevail in high places. In Oxford, there will be found a Sherardian Professor of Botany and Agriculture, together with readers in mineralogy and geology; and we have chairs of botany, mineralogy, and geology in the sister university of Cambridge. Trinity College, Dublin, likewise occupies a condition of equality with her English relations, and all of them agree in overlooking ZOOLOGY, although the most important department of the science.

When the University College, London, was founded in 1826, zoology occupied a prominent place, along with mineralogy and botany. Three years later, on the formation of King's College, the four branches of natural history were, at last, fully recognised, and chairs of mineralogy, geology, botany, and zoology were instituted. Naturalists, at this time, began to indulge the hope, that their favourite branch of study, in its several important bearings, was now secured in its proper position in the United Kingdom. But their expectations were destined to be speedily withered by a retrograde movement, under the sanction of the imperial government. In the new colleges in Ireland, a chair

of natural history certainly occupies a place, but there is, at the same time, a chair which includes mineralogy and geology. Assuming that the chairs of natural history in these colleges embrace botany and zoology, then, in the opinion of our rulers, these two branches of science can be satisfactorily taught by the same individual, in the course of a single session, and that mineralogy, including metallurgy, together with geology, are equally limited and comprehensible.

In the colleges of Scotland, natural history cannot be contemplated as occupying a respectable position. In the University of St. Andrews and the Marischal College of Aberdeen, we find natural history, by some strange coincidences, united with civil history—while, in the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, botany constitutes a separate class, and to the occupants of the natural history chair are consigned the sciences of mineralogy, geology, and zoology. To any one acquainted with the important nature and vast extent of those three branches of science, destined to be taught by a single individual, in the course of a single session, it will appear obvious that the task must be executed perfunctorily. In truth, a single watchman would be as competent for the protection of the lives and property of the citizens of Edinburgh, as a professor thus overburdened, to execute his immense task with even tolerable success. We earnestly recommend this important subject to the favourable consideration of our university reformers.

While we have cause to complain that natural history is not suitably recognised, in reference to its constituent branches, we equally lament that its very position in the educational course is either overlooked or transposed. In illustration of this remark we may state, that in the University of Edinburgh, natural history and botany, by a strange combination of circumstances, are considered as the appropriate and peculiar study of the youthful aspirants to medical practice. The occupants of the chairs are considered as belonging to the medical faculty, and deemed co-ordinate with anatomy, surgery, midwifery, or medicine. Indeed, in the published programme for the present session, in the list of chairs natural history occupies a station intermediate between anatomy and midwifery! A student, in order to qualify for obtaining the degree of "Doctor of Medicine," must attend the classes of natural history and botany, and be separately examined by the professors of these sciences. He must likewise attend the class of materia medica, and a third examination be submitted to, for the purpose of testing the knowledge of the candidate respecting the application of natural history and botany to medical purposes.

We have never been able to discover any satisfactory reason why mineralogy, geology, botany, and zoology should be considered requisite to form a physician any more than a divine or a lawyer. Nor should it be concealed that, in consequence of those branches of science being attached to the medical faculty, parents are too frequently prevented from directing their youth-head to the study of those important departments of knowledge with which every one laying claim to a "liberal education" should be acquainted. Let the patrons of the university remove these chairs from the medical faculty, and place them, together with chemistry, in their proper position along with the usual classes in the faculty of arts. The demand for attendance on such classes by the medical faculty need not be altered, while a new and important element would be introduced in reference to the degree of "Master of Arts."

Changes of the kind now recommended, although fully within the power of the Magistrates of Edinburgh, as patrons of the university, would be opposed by a few, and the seemingly high authority of the Royal Commissioners of Inquiry into the State of the Universities of Scotland, (1831,) produced in justification. In their "Report," which is of a very anomalous character, while the said Commissioners statute and *ordain* that the candidate for the degree of doctor in medicine "shall attend the class of botany in a university," and *enjoin* a course of chemistry during the first session, they only "*recommend* attendance upon a course" of natural history. In order to obtain the degree of "Master of Arts," they overlook botany altogether, but statute and ordain that attendance shall be required in the classes of natural history and chemistry. The same rules are prescribed for the curriculum of the University of Glasgow, from which we may infer that the Royal Commissioners considered botany as *exclusively* a fit subject for the student of medicine, while natural history should belong to the arts.

Several years later, the Royal Commissioners for visiting the Aberdeen colleges, recommended the institution of a single chair for natural history and botany to be comprehended in the medical faculty, along with chemistry. From this recommendation, it appears that these Royal Commissioners were not aware of the character of the branches of knowledge legitimately included under the term natural history, and added botany, because, somewhere or somehow, they had heard of such a class constituting a part of the medical curriculum.

We have, in these preliminary remarks, wandered perhaps a little from our proper path, in the hope that our well-meant re-

marks may be instrumental in calling public attention to our deplorable condition in reference to natural history, and awaken our really earnest educationists to the consideration of an important subject. We have no objections to a grant of public money for the endowment of a chair of botany, or the maintenance of a botanic garden; but we at the same time assert our conviction, that a chair of zoology ought to be instituted in all our universities, with its appropriate appendage,—a zoological garden. Palms require a lofty roof, so do giraffes,—“weeds and vermin” should share alike. Nor should we forget, that, in a country abounding in valuable minerals and ores, the source of a considerable share of our national wealth, we have not, in Scotland, a single chair in any of our universities appropriated to the study of mineralogy! Let us now more particularly advert to botany or phytology.

The late Professor Moles of Friburgh, announced that, “of all the departments into which natural history has been divided, botany is the most complete and advanced. The idea of natural history may therefore be developed best by considering this division of it. Now, *botany is nothing else than the science of finding the systematic name of a plant from its known or observed natural properties*, that is to say, by means of its characters, *or of finding the natural properties when the name is given*; and all the arrangements, subdivisions, and collocations employed by this science are directed to this purpose. Natural history is therefore nothing else than the science of finding the systematic name from the characters of *a production of nature generally, or vice versa.*”

We have selected this statement as giving a tolerably fair representation of those notions which are entertained by many respecting natural history, and the character of the methods or systems which are employed in extending its limits, or in exhibiting the importance of its conquests. These sentiments, however, seem to indicate the prevailing indistinct conceptions of the true principles of arrangement, and serve to encourage exertions in a direction where success cannot reasonably be looked for.

The student of botany. or the learner, pursues one course, the experienced botanist another. The operations of the former are chiefly analytical, while those of the latter are in a great measure synthetical. Adopting this view of the subject, let us in the first instance contemplate the efforts of one beginning the study. He is made aware that there is a *stock of knowledge* in botany as in other sciences, constituted by the labours of those who have trodden the path of inquiry, and who have published the re-

sult of these exertions. But these recorded observations cannot become available without an acquaintance with the terms in which it is necessary to express them. We may find in the index of a book, *Avena*, *Bromus*, *Juncus*, or *Rumex*, and believe that those terms refer to things existing, but this will not serve without other aid, to conduct us to the things themselves. We must begin with the study of organisms, and endeavour by analytical processes to connect them with the terms by which they are expressed or represented. The index we can now employ, at this comparatively advanced stage, and it will enable us readily to ascertain all that the author has published on the subject. In this manner, at a very easy rate, and by something like a *royal road*, we can rank as shareholders in the common stock, and receive our dividend as contributed by the labours of others.

The practice of beginning the study of botany by ascertaining the meaning of the terms employed, with the view of gaining an acquaintance with the knowledge of plants which has been recorded—*this finding of names*, is usually entered upon by the help of what is termed the *artificial method*. This phrase, however, is faulty in the extreme, and with some advantage might be denominated the *discriminative system*. In the employment of this method, we observe differences and resemblances, positive and negative characters, as so many sign-posts to guide us to the wished for end—the name of the plant, in order, that through the appropriate terms we may be able to search its history—in its peculiar structure, mode of growth, appointed locality, and specific properties.

In the artificial or *discriminative* system, therefore, those distinguishing characters are the best which conduct, with the least labour or by the shortest road, to the object aimed at, which is nothing more than to become acquainted with the *name*. At this stage of the process, however, the students of botany usually separate into two well marked groups.

The first comprehends those who flatter themselves that they have become botanists when they are able to call the stinging nettle *Urtica urens*, the curled dock *Rumex crispus*, and can gabble out a few such binary terms. Unfortunately, the prevailing ignorance of the public favours the growth of this sort of quackery, and too frequently permits such contemptible jabberers to pass for botanists. The second group includes such as search after the name, in the first instance, with the view of making themselves acquainted with the known history of plants, for the purpose of guiding their researches after truth, and at the same time to qualify them for adding to those treasures which their

predecessors have so liberally provided. Such inquirers soon perceive the true purpose of the artificial method, and seek to become acquainted with those synthetical operations which display the progress of the science, and the knowledge which has been acquired of the rules and purposes of the Supreme.

When the student of botany has advanced in his labours to such an extent as to become tolerably familiar with the names and uses of the more ordinary plants, he commences a process of grouping, endeavouring to trace relations of form, structure, function, and distribution. This so called *natural method*, now offers him the required assistance, and professes to exhibit the peculiarities of the social condition of vegetable society. Here, however, difficulties present themselves of no ordinary magnitude. In the *discriminative* system we frame our own rules, and feel ourselves at liberty to follow the easiest or the shortest course. But in the natural method we attempt to discover these, and to exhibit the plans and procedure of the Creator—the relations which he has established, and the harmony, which, by various and complicated adaptations, appears everywhere to prevail.

In the formation of a natural method botanists, in general, seem to have committed a great error, by overlooking the important fact that the different systems of organs constituting a plant do not maintain the same co-ordinate degree of development, when we trace their exhibited features, in any extensive or even limited series of species. Let us take the genus elder or *Sambucus* as an illustrative example. The group is termed a *natural* one, while the differences which prevail and by which the species are constituted are not merely those of degree, but of kind. We pass over the circumstances of the *cymes* of the common elder,—*S. nigra*, having five, while those of the dwarf elder,—*S. ebulus*, have only three main branches; and also the obsolete stipules of the former and the foliaceous stipules of the latter; for the magic word atrophy will sufficiently mystify even these *permanent* differences so as to permit the two plants to occupy a place in the same genus. But how shall we establish a relationship between the arboreous stem of the common elder and the herbaceous stem of the dwarf species? In the former species the developing buds of this year build up a stem which receives symmetrical additions in each succeeding year throughout the life of the plant. Widely different is the condition of the latter in reference to the laws of its growth. The plant produces a bud at the plane between the root and the stem while it is ripening its seeds, and then dies. The bud, thus produced, becomes evolved in the following season, when the stems and roots of its progenitor have returned to dust. Can any grouping

be more artificial than this? Whence does it proceed? On attentive consideration we shall find that every system of organs, as the supporting, nutritive, protective and reproductive, may be respectively employed as the basis or standard of classification; but we shall find that, having selected our system of organs, some of the other systems will appear in rebellion. In other words, a linear arrangement that does not violate affinity is impracticable, while it would be easy to prove that we may have as many natural, or affinitive methods, as we have systems of organs among plants. Viewing methods in this light we need not wonder at the author of "*A Descriptive Account of the Polo de Vaca*" thus expressing himself:—"I fully and freely grant that the Jussieuan arrangement has rare excellencies and is possessed of many virtues; I only protest against the assumed title which its votaries claim for it,—'the Natural System.' What! are the *bread-fruit tree* and the *cow tree* natural associates of the *nettle*, or the *dock* or *rhubarb* of the *seaside grape*? When men gather figs of thorns and grapes of thistles, when incongruity means congruity, then may the Jussieuan arrangement be emphatically denominated, *par excellence*,—the NATURAL SYSTEM!"

The science of botany, although founded on a knowledge of the form and structure of plants, and largely occupied with their discrimination and arrangement, embraces another and more generally interesting field of inquiry,—the DISTRIBUTION OF PLANTS. On this subject, Mr. Watson, in the work before us, enters with great earnestness and success, leaving the student of British botany without excuse if he confines his attention merely to names and forms. Before, however, we particularly call the attention of our readers to the peculiar claims of the "*Cybele Britannica*," we deem it expedient to make a few general observations for the purpose of rendering our remarks more easily comprehended.

The distribution of plants naturally divides itself into two branches,—geographical and physical. When the localities of the individuals of a species have been determined, it will be found that they extend latitudinally and longitudinally over a certain space, which is termed the AREA of its GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION. This area differs greatly in its magnitude in different species, and in the mode in which the individuals are dispersed on its surface. The Winter's bark (*Drimys winteri*) abounds on the Continent of America over no less than eighty-six degrees of latitude, while the individuals of the Kerguelen's land cabbage are confined to that single spot on the earth's surface, which, in other respects, has secured for it the unenviable title of the "Island of Desolation."

In an area of geographical distribution, which, like a river basin in its springs, is enclosed by a line drawn around all the localities, the individuals may be gregarious or solitary, distributed with tolerable uniformity or occurring throughout the space in patches at irregular and often distant intervals. Each species has its own peculiar area of distribution, and hence the areas of the different species will be found to overlap one another in every conceivable manner, in consequence of the great differences prevailing in their extent and form, apart from their interior arrangements.

In examining the peculiar positions which the individuals of different species occupy in the areas of their geographical distribution, we find those of one species occupying the sea, while those of another are confined to lakes and rivers. Some species dwell on the seashore, while others prefer an inland site,—the plains or the summits of the mountains. In these various positions great differences prevail in reference to moisture, light, and heat, which, separately or combined, constitute the conditions intended to be expressed by the phrase,—“THE PHYSICAL DISTRIBUTION OF PLANTS.” Their distribution, however, is frequently modified to a considerable extent by the power of accommodation to circumstances which plants possess, as living beings, and by which they can occupy positions, in their geographical area, varying in their physical conditions. Thus, thrift, scurvy-grass, and others, ordinarily found on the seashore, can likewise thrive on high mountains; in the latter situation employing potash as the substitute for the soda, and losing the iodine which they contained in their ordinary haunts. The translation of plants by human agency furnishes proof that the area of a species may be greatly more confined than is rendered necessary by its constitutional character. Thus, in our own country we have greatly extended the geographical occupancy of many culinary vegetables; and if we look to our West Indian possessions the case appears even in a stronger point of view. In these islands the most valuable materials of their export are derived from plants which have been removed from their natural areas, and cultivated under considerably different physical conditions. We may here refer to the rice, sugar-cane, cotton, indigo, coffee, ginger, and many others.

Perhaps the most obvious physical distribution of plants is into those of sea and land. Although this distinction is, in ordinary circumstances, sufficiently obvious, yet when we attempt to assign to either group a definite limit, we feel no inconsiderable difficulty. On many flat marshy shores may be witnessed the *Cladonia maritima* living in company with the *Fucus vesiculosus*,

thus uniting the flowering plants with the algæ, and rendering the *grass-line* a doubtful limit. The *Verbucaria maura* and *Fucus nodosus* grow together, thus conjoining the algæ and lichens, while the algæ and mosses coalesce in locality by the contiguous group of *Lachina pygmaea* and *Grimmea maritima*.

When the modes of distribution of the land plants are carefully examined, we cannot fail to observe that the physical conditions of certain localities, with respect to moisture and dryness, regulate the distribution of particular species. This circumstance did not escape the notice of the earlier observers, as indicated by the questions "Can the rush grow up without mire? can the flag grow without water?" These are, indeed, questions which many farmers of the old school in various parts of the kingdom do not, even at this comparatively advanced period, sufficiently comprehend. The laws, however, which are here referred to, may be traced in their full operation by attending to the places of growth or abodes of our wild plants, as is well illustrated in the work before us.

The author of "*Cybele Britannica*" has been well known for several years as a diligent inquirer into the geographical and physical distribution of our native species. At the close of the year 1832, he printed and circulated privately a small work under the title "*Outlines of the Geographical Distribution of British Plants*," and obtained, in consequence, a number of important contributions for a more extended production. Accordingly in 1835 he published his "*Remarks on the Geographical Distribution of British Plants chiefly in connexion with Latitude, Elevation, and Climate*." In the present work, the first volume of which appeared in 1847, the author enters more minutely into the characters of their distribution, and in his introductory remarks explains the origin of the title. He considers "the study of geographical botany, or investigations into the distributions of plants over the surface of the earth as a branch of knowledge distinct from that which is more exclusively concerned with the technical classification and description of species. This study has been variously denominated '*Phytography*,' '*Botanical Geography*,' '*Geographical Botany*,' and '*Geographical Distribution of Plants*.' These compound names are all of them objectionable, they are inconveniently long for titles of books, and none of them can be said sufficiently to express the scope of the present work. The author ventures, therefore, to substitute the mythological name of CYBELE; that is the name of the goddess who was supposed to preside over the productions of the earth. The name of '*Flora*' has long been used for those catalogues of plants in which are described the species of any definite section of the

earth; that of 'Cybele' appears quite as applicable to one which is intended to show their relations to the earth as local productions of the ground and climate."

We do not consider it a subject of sufficient interest to investigate the relative merits of the rivals Flora and Cybele. There is much in a good name, but sometimes in science there appears to be a peculiar charm about a *new* one.

The author, for the accomplishment of his object, has found it necessary to change the conventional arrangement of the surface of our island, observing, "The counties being thus too numerous, while the three ancient political divisions (England, Wales, Scotland) are too few and unequal for the object of this work, an intermediate set of sections became necessary,—larger than mere counties—smaller than kingdoms. In fixing upon such intermediate sections, it has appeared most convenient to make them in conformity with the old established divisions into kingdoms and counties; as much regard being still given to the physical geography of Britain as is consistent with the prescribed rule. In forming these sections a mutual line was first traced from the south coast of England, northwards into the Highlands of Scotland; the line corresponding with the boundaries of counties, and being traced in that course which would best divide the counties whose rivers flow to the east coast, from those whose waters are emptied into the western ocean. The two longitudinal divisions were then transversely subdivided into PROVINCES, or groups of counties which together constitute the basin of a principal river, or have some other physical peculiarity in common. The medial line was not continued northward of Inverness, where Scotland becomes very narrow, and counties extend from the east to the west coast. The wide county of Inverness itself, also extending from east to west, is bisected by the line; the eastern portion (Moray, including the small counties of Elgin and Nairn) being thus divided from the western portion." By this mode of proceeding, our author has constituted eighteen PROVINCES, the first of which is termed the "Peninsula," and includes Cornwall, Devon, and Somerset, and the last, "the North Isles," includes the Hebrides, Orkney and Shetland. These subdivisions, it must be noticed, are unconnected with physical condition, arbitrary in their grouping, and calculated to distract by the novelty of their titles. Who would expect to find the county of Ayr among the "West Lowlands, or the Hebrides in the North Isles?" The reasons assigned for this peculiar mode of mapping are by no means satisfactory, and not calculated to render more minute or accurate our acquaintance with native plants.

In the arrangement of British plants according to the ascend-

ing or climatic zones, our author has experienced difficulties which he very candidly acknowledges :—

“ On a single mountain, as we have seen, local changes in the character of its surface, and the difference of aspect on its declivities, will disturb the regularity of its ascending zones. On an extended range of mountains the disturbing effect of local peculiarities will become much more obvious. And when we have to adapt our zones to several groups of mountains, dissimilar in extent, elevation, latitude, maritime proximity, and other circumstances, it then becomes difficult to define them with any exactness. This difficulty is experienced in tracing the ascending zones of plants in Britain. The absolute elevation at which the same species will grow, varies by many hundred feet on different mountains. And as this variation is by no means uniform with different species, we find local changes in their relative elevation also, the limit of one being compared with the limit of another. Notwithstanding such local exceptions, however, the general rule will be found true, *that a species which rises higher than another on one range of mountains, will usually be found higher on other ranges*; and the commoner the species the more exact is the rule found to be.

“ As before explained, it is upon the prevailing regularity of this fact or rule, that the climatic zones of plants are founded and defined; the presence or absence of some common and conspicuous species being made the test of the zone. The primary division which is here to be proposed, as one best applicable in Britain, is ostensibly founded upon an artificial character, namely, the presence or absence of cultivation. It is by this character that we may distinguish the lower from the upper zones of plants; giving to the former the common designation of *Agrarian*, and calling the latter by the name of *Arctic* zones; or, to prevent confusion with subordinate divisions, it may be well to say, in the first instance, *Agrarian regions* and *Arctic regions*.

“ In the spontaneous vegetation of Britain, we can find no character equally obvious and general with that afforded by the cultivation of grain. The interests of mankind are so intimately connected with the production of corn, that we shall everywhere find cultivated fields as far up the valleys and acclivities of the mountains as their climate will allow. No doubt, we may see many spots where the nature of the soil and surface, rather than the climate, forbids success in cultivation. But a correct observer can scarcely be misled in such instances, since he will usually find cultivation sufficiently near those spots, to show that it has not been prevented by inferiority of climate. Moreover, nature will afford us a second test of the agrarian region, by the presence of a very common and conspicuous fern, the *Pteris aquilina*. This fern is distributed throughout the region, and from one extremity of our island to the other; its upper limit usually running nearly uniform with the climate limit of corn cultivation, so that the two characters in connexion form a satisfactory test of the regions. The plough is soon fatal to the *Pteris*, nor can it long resist

the attack of the scythe in early summer; but we require its presence as a character only in those spots which remain uninvaded by scythe or ploughshare, and in such spots we seldom seek in vain, until arriving about the line where climate duly arrests the ascent of agriculture.

"Among the Highland mountains the highest spot at which the cultivation of grain has been observed by the writer of these pages, was at the outlet of Loch Callater, estimated to be 1600 feet above the level of the sea. Potatoes can scarcely be grown in Drumochter Pass, which is calculated at 1530 feet above the level of the sea, and is much more shadowed by mountains, than is the outlet of Loch Callater. From 1000 to 1200 feet is more frequently the actual limit of corn and potatoes in the Highlands. In one sheltered spot, in the woods of Lochnagar, the *Pteris* was observed at 1900 feet, and in another part of the same woods at 1700 feet. On exposed moors of the Highlands generally, it is very seldom seen above 1200 feet, unless in hollow depressions, or on those declivities which front to the sun. On open moors the *Myrica gale* will rise higher than the *Pteris*; having been seen at 1700 feet on a bleak exposure in the forest of Drumochter, which forms a part of the northern declivity of the central Grampians, and is stamped by the impoverished or arctic character of the vegetation at comparatively moderate altitudes. More frequently the *Myrica gale* ceases at 1400 or 1500 feet. Upon these two regional divisions, we may found an arrangement of species into three climatic groups, thus:—

"Arctics,—found only in the arctic region.

"Arctic-Agrarians,—found in both regions.

"Agrarians,—found only in the agrarian region."

Our readers will have little difficulty in perceiving that these divisions of plants into regions in a descending series, is little more than a very rude approximation to a mode of grouping, varying with every mountain side, soil, exposure, and wind. The same remark is equally applicable to those regions the latitude of which regulates the arrangement. In both cases the apparently definite phraseology employed, betrays the incautious reader into the belief that the boundaries assigned are nearly as well marked as the Parliamentary limits of a borough, or the separating land-marks of contiguous counties. But let our author state his own case:—

"In addition to their distribution by provinces and climatic zones, there is a third mode of indicating the geographical relations of plants, which may also require some explanation. It has been before observed, that certain species are spread over the whole island, while others are limited to one, two, three, or more provinces. The same holds true in the zones; some species occurring in all of them, others

in one or more. Perhaps no two species have exactly the same distribution or relative frequency; and yet certain general similarities may be traced, by which the species may be grouped together, under a few leading types of distribution."

The author now assigns the following titles to his types:—1. *British Type*. 2. *English Type*. 3. *Scottish Type*. 4. *Highland Type*. 5. *Germanic Type*. 6. *Atlantic Type*. 7. *Local or Doubtful Type*. Having disposed of these groups, and in connexion with this subject, he very freely accuses Professor Edward Forbes as having, in a hypothetical essay on the origin and migration of British plants, taken "to himself credit for results and generalizations which had truly originated with the author of the present work." In the temper of one suffering under the influence of a conviction of plagiarism, he characterizes Mr. Forbes's essay as consisting of "borrowed facts, misunderstood and applied by a forgetive imagination which make up the botanical illustrations in favour of the hypothesis. And thus so far from really establishing that hypothesis upon any sound botanical evidence, the second attempt is, indeed, little better than a burlesque upon the vegetable geography of Britain, by the partial selection of the facts adduced, their inaccuracy or inapplicability, and inattention to those climatal requirements of the species, which must of themselves constitute insuperable objections against the soundness of the hypothesis respecting their origin and migrations. In short, considering the small number of the pages in Mr. Forbes's second essay, which are devoted to the botanical bearings of the subject, it absolutely teems with errors in its botany—inconclusive arguments, inconsequent logic, inept illustrations, and the guesswork of the imagination put forth ostensibly as the ascertained facts of science."

We do consider the merit of Mr. Watson, in having either in his "Remarks," or in his *Cybele*, distributed British plants into types, as of small amount. Whoever has examined, with any degree of care, the *loca natalia* of the "*Philosophia Botanica*" of Linnæus, or Adanson's preface to his "*Familles des Plantes*" must have been prepared for the groups exhibited in the "*Cybele*," especially if he followed up his researches by a study of the generalizations of Wallenberg, Willdenow, and Humboldt. By the aid, however, of even the earlier works, our author's labours in constructing either his "Remarks" or his "*Cybele*," required industry rather than originality; while, under the guidance of Schow, and aided by Turner's "*Botanist's Guide*," the composition of his useful work became scarcely more than a mechanical operation, conducted, however, by one to whom

the subject was familiar in all its bearings. We may add, that Professor E. Forbes's references to Mr. Watson's labours are decided and complimentary.

In the "introductory explanations" to the third volume of the "Cybele," the author gives us ground to hope that he may yet furnish us with details, illustrative of the areas of distribution of our native plants, in reference to other portions of the earth where they occur. We earnestly hope that he may have life, leisure, and zeal to execute the task. "The causes (he says) that now continue the existing distribution of plants over the surface of the earth, or those that have originally and gradually determined their distribution, are too wide in their influence to admit of being properly treated in a work devoted to the plants of one small country, and to their distribution within that limited space only. Should the author have life and leisure to carry out *his* present wishes, and enduring inclination adequate to the task, he may, perhaps, write a '*British and Foreign Cybele*' for the purpose of tracing the distribution of British species over other parts of the earth, and of showing the true relation borne by the flora of Britain to the floras of neighbouring countries. The causes or conditions of their distribution might then appropriately find a place and room in a work of that more comprehensive and necessarily less detailed character. His investigations have not hitherto led him to adopt the current opinion, (or rather, mere guess,) that the flora of the British islands has been derived from the opposite countries of the Continent,—at least not to any greater proportionate extent than the floras of those countries may be said to have been derived from Britain. Interchange has most likely taken place; Britain giving as well as receiving."

The subject to which our author here refers has, of late years, been somewhat prominently brought forward, and as it is one of deep interest, in connexion with the peopling of the globe, we shall conclude our labours at present, by making a few remarks on some of its more prominent features.

The celebrated naturalist of Sweden, Linneæ, entertained the opinion that the dry land was continually increasing by the sinking or decrease of the waters, and concluded, "that instead of the present wide extended regions, one small island was only in the beginning raised above the surface of the waters." And he adds, "If we trace back the multiplication of all plants and animals as we did that of mankind, we must stop at our original pair of each species. There must therefore have been in this island a kind of living museum, so furnished with plants and animals, that nothing was wanting of all the present produce of

the earth. Whatever nature yields for the use or pleasure of mankind, was here presented to our first parents; they were therefore completely happy. If that favoured man was obliged to acquire the knowledge of all these things in the same order, and according to the same laws of nature to which we are subject, that is, by means of the external senses, he must have taken a view of the nature, form, and qualities of each animal, in order to distinguish it by a suitable name and character; so that the chief employment of the first man, in this garden or museum of delight, was to examine the admirable works of his Creator."

Wildenow adopted the notion that every primitive mountain was the centre of the origin of peculiar species, so that the number of floras would be co-extensive with the distribution of such ancient elevations. According to this view of the original localities of species, the migration of the individuals took place from the respective summits towards the plains, and thus a general distribution, according to circumstances, took place over the surfaces of contiguous districts.

Dr. Hooker, in his valuable *FLORA ANTARCTICA*, specifically refers to the subject in the following passage:—"If species, genera, and small natural orders were sporadic, recurring wherever climate and soil presented similar conditions, several points of origin for the same species might be assumed. But it is not so: species, genera, and orders are distributed within geographical limits, according to the extent; the great mass of individual plants in the one case, and of forms in the other, appear to have sprung from single centres, in the former case from a common parent, and to have radiated from one point to greater or less distances around it, in proportion to the facilities for migration and absence of checks to diffusion. The explanation of exceptions to this prevailing rule must then be sought for in some natural cause, capable of counteracting the general law, and not what, if adopted for the case of one species must be conceded with respect to all, and consequently force us to conclude that two classes of agents are required to effect our object, namely, the dispersion of vegetables."

Professor Edward Forbes, in a speculative paper already referred to, "On the connexion between the distribution of the existing Fauna and Flora of the British Isles, and the geographical changes which have affected their area, especially during the epoch of the Northern Drift," published in the first volume of the *Memoirs of the Geological Survey of Great Britain*, (1846,) furnishes the following startling announcement:—"In the following remarks on the history of the indigenous fauna

and flora of the British Islands and the neighbouring sea, I take for granted the existence of *specific centres*, i.e., of certain geographical points from which the individuals of each species have been diffused. This indeed must be taken for granted, if the idea of a species (as most naturalists hold) involves the idea of the relationship of all the individuals composing it, and their consequent descent from a single progenitor, or from two, according as the sexes might be united or distinct.

"That this view is true, the following facts go far to prove. 1st, Species of opposite hemispheres placed under similar conditions, are *representative* and not *identical*; 2d, Species occupying similar conditions in geological formations far apart, and which conditions are not met with in the intermediate formations, are representative and not identical; 3d, Wherever a given assemblage of conditions, to which, and to which only, certain species are adapted, are continuous,—whether geographically or geologically,—identical species range throughout.

"I offer no comment on these three great facts, (he should modestly have called them *assertions*,) which I present for the consideration of the few naturalists who doubt the doctrine of specific centres. The general and traditional belief of mankind has connected the idea of descent with that of distant *kinds*, or species of creatures; and the abandonment of this doctrine would place in a very dubious position, all evidence the palæontologist could offer to the geologist, towards the comparison and identification of strata, and the determination of the epoch of their formation.

"Moreover, it is notorious that the doctrine of more than one point of origin for a single species, and consequently more than one primogenitor for the individuals of it, sprung out of apparent anomalies and difficulties in distribution, such as those I am about to show can be reasonably accounted for, without having recourse to such a supposition."

Although in the last paragraph of the quotation, the author assures us that he can reasonably account for the difficulties which have prevented converts to the hypothesis which he advocates, yet he afterwards confesses—"It cannot be expected that in this stage of the inquiry all exceptional cases in our flora and fauna can be explained. There are several extremely difficult of explanation, but they are neither so numerous nor of sufficient importance to affect the general argument, and may safely be put aside for the present, in the certainty that the progress of research will ere long make clear the most doubtful."

In all these references to the speculations of the preceding naturalists, it will be observed that the individuals of the differ-

ent species are considered as having derived their origin according to their kind from a single plant or pair, as the sexes were separate or conjoined; and that the individuals proceeding from these pairs having multiplied, migrated from their common, or *specific centre*, to the different localities, within the area of their distribution, which they now occupy.

The learned Professor of Botany in the London University, from whose speculative paper we have made the preceding quotations, distributes the plants of Britain into five well-marked floras, and by this arrangement paves the way for assigning to the different species the central spot of their ancestral creation. Some of the plants of the west and south-west of Ireland, being identical with Spanish species, he derives from that country, and supposes that they passed over to their present habitation when there was no gulf, and nothing but dry land between Asturias and the Green Isle. This portion of our flora he terms the **ASTURIAN TYPE**. Three assumptions are here introduced, and are of a piece with what the author terms "*grand facts*." The first is the existence of specific centres; secondly, that these centres were in Spain not Ireland, and consequently, that the migration was in a westerly direction; and, thirdly, that a convenient passage was afforded them, during their transit, by continuous land instead of a now stormy sea.

The plants of the south-west of England and the south-east of Ireland, which constitute the region of the Devon Flora, or **NORMAN TYPE**, together with the plants of the south-east of England, characterized as the Kentish or **NORTH FRENCH TYPE**, are all assumed as having migrated from France ere the Straits of Dover were formed, and when this country was conjoined in surface with France. Our remarks on the origin of the plants of the Asturian Type, being applicable, need not be repeated here.

The flora constituting the **ALPINE TYPE** comprises plants which are located on the Scottish mountains, and on those of Cumberland and Wales. This type has exercised the imagination to a much greater extent than when necessary to unite Ireland with Spain, or England with France. It is *assumed* that at this period all the districts of the north portions of Europe and Britain were submerged in the sea, with the exceptions of a few projecting points or islets. The sea was an icy one, and from those peaks scattered over its surface, the specific centres of our Alpine plants, proceeded the individuals of the different species on icebergs and glacial plains, chiefly from the Scandinavian Alps, and peopled the lower hills as the process of the elevation of the land proceeded. These Alpine plants, in consequence of the

difficulties of migration, appear to diminish in number as we retire from their sources or specific centres. The assumptions here are too numerous to escape observation, and too extravagant to need comment.

When the frozen period terminated, and the upheaved bed of the glacial sea exhibited Germany, Britain, and Ireland a continuous country, then the plants of central and western Europe, which the cold of the adjacent sea had not destroyed, began to people the new formed land, invade the older provinces, and to become "overspread and commingled" with the floras of the other provinces. These species constitute the GERMANIC TYPE. They would have been greatly more numerous in Britain and Ireland, it is said, if the formation of the German Ocean and St. George's Channel had not taken place during the process of westerly migration, and thus prevented many species, with more limited travelling power, from reaching the localities which their former associates had succeeded in occupying.

To those who feel amused at this game of "geological ninepins," we have no observation to offer. Along with our sober-minded readers, however, we must lament that such outrages against the inductive philosophy can be committed with impunity. There seems to be an utter unconsciousness of any difference existing between a fact and a fiction, and hence, adopting an *assumption* in the first instance, the mind fearlessly proceeds with *supposition* after *supposition*, until it has reared its baseless fabric. Apart altogether from these geological suppositions or dreams, the supporters of this ideal migration of plants have several very formidable difficulties to contend with, to two of which only we shall at present refer.

The manner in which the individuals of a species are scattered over the area of their distribution deserves particular attention. They sometimes occur in nearly continuous sheets, so that their origin from a single centre may not be difficult to account for. But in other cases, as we have already stated, the individuals of a species are found occupying irregular patches, of different dimensions; with interspaces frequently of many miles in extent. Thus, Dr. Hooker, in the "Flora Antarctica," (vol. ii. p. 260,) says of the *Lathyrus maritimus*, "The English channel seems its southern European limit, whence it passes along the shore of Belgium and up the Baltic Sea, and inhabits the east coast of Norway as far as 70°, becoming more frequent beyond the parallel of 60°; eastward of the north cape again, it is plentiful throughout Lapland, to the Sea of Archangel, but does not cross the longer side of the Ural Mountains; thence to the Sea of Okholok, that is, all over the Siberian plains, it is replaced by the *Lathyrus pisi-*

forms, L. (fide Ledebour,) but reappears to the extreme east of the continent of Asia in Okholsk and Kamtschatka." The same author in another page (210) of the same volume, in a note, says, "There are, however, instances of sudden change in the vegetation occurring, unaccompanied with any diversity of geological or other feature. The river Obi in Siberia, whose direction is towards the north-west, from the latitude of 50° to 67° , affords a most remarkable instance of this phenomenon, first mentioned by Gmelin and afterwards by Humboldt. * Some of the most conspicuous trees attain either of its banks, but do not cross them; those of the regions to the west of this stream reappearing only on the confines of China. I have received from Baron Humboldt much highly interesting verbal information upon the distribution of organized beings in Siberia; the disappearance of some animals and plants over a vast area, and their reappearance at another, in obedience to no known law, are very striking facts. I must content myself with referring to the preface to Gmelin's "*Flora Siberica*," for copious examples of these seeming anomalies in the distribution of vegetables.

How can the detached condition of the individuals of these lawless species be reconciled to the notion of a specific centre of distribution and subsequent diffusion therefrom? The intelligent author, from whom we have made the preceding extracts, endeavours to wriggle out of the difficulty, by imagining the possibility of the individuals of the species, now occurring in distant and separate patches, having been "destroyed in the intervening positions which they may formerly have inhabited;" that individuals may exist in the apparently void spaces, "but in a hitherto unrecognised form;" or hope for an explanation "in some natural cause capable of counteracting the general law." Professor E. Forbes, as previously quoted, conveniently puts these exceptional cases "aside for the present."

But the most formidable objection to the doctrine of primary centres of distribution, and consequent migration, arises from the well established fact, that many plants of the northern hemisphere are specifically identical with those of the southern hemisphere—the arctic and antarctic floras having many species in common. The migration across the tropics being too bold a conception to be entertained, equally with the submergence and elevation of the land, or the temporary existence of a glacial sea, Professor E. Forbes cuts the knot which he could not untie, and removes the obstacle by the bold *assertion* which he afterwards complacently contemplates as a *fact*, "that species of opposite hemispheres, placed under similar conditions, are *representative*, not *identical*." We give this zealous naturalist and

professor of botany all credit for the boldness of the assertion, but we must at the same time offer proof of its worthlessness.

From the days of John Ray to the present time, botanists believed that when they found two plants corresponding in form and structure, whether occurring in Europe or Africa, the south or the north side of the tropics, they were individuals of the same species. This, indeed, is the foundation of all botanical arrangements—we may say of biology. Robert Brown, than whom no living observer has contributed more important illustrations to the physiology of plants—a circumstance which drew from Humboldt the expression, “*Botanicorum facile princeps*,”—furnished, in the appendix to “*Flinders’s Voyage*,” a “List of plants natives both of Terra Australia and of Europe.” This list comprises one hundred and sixty-six species; and we may add, on the best authority, that the first plant recorded, *Potentilla anserina*, was detected in a spot not previously visited by any European. Dr. Hooker likewise, in the “*Flora Antarctica*,” enumerates nearly two hundred species identical with northern forms. The author of the “*Cybele*,” and other trustworthy friends, were called to assist in making the comparisons; and the conclusion respecting identity was not drawn, until much examination and consideration had been employed. Are we then to discard such evidence, the highest which science can in the present day produce, and embrace an unsupported assertion? If we do, then botanical authority ceases, the wisdom of experience is at fault, and the grounds of distinction among species have been removed; for resemblance in form and structure no longer warrant us to infer identity. The *representative* rule being once adopted, and for the purpose, mainly, of getting rid of a difficulty, we may proceed to assert that certain of the plants of Britain are not identical with those of Spain, France, or Germany, although formerly considered as the same species, they being merely representative; or, that the formerly supposed species found on the south and the north sides of Snowdon are not identical but mutually representative. We must therefore unhesitatingly regard this hypothesis of *representation*, devised for the purpose of supporting a favourite vision, as opposed to every principle of sound reasoning.

We have stated that the opinion of plants having sprung from individuals or pairs as specific centres, has very generally prevailed from the days of Linnæus to the present time. Were we under any necessity to admit this *assumption* as a *fact*, then it would be justifiable, perhaps, to call on the imagination to supply us with the means of escape from the many difficulties, acknowledged by all as inseparable from its adoption. The origin of

the human race from a single pair, need not be here enlarged upon, as it is now a generally recognised truth among zoologists. But will this truth furnish an analogical argument in favour of the notion, that all animals and plants were derived from a single progenitor, or from two, according as the sexes might be united or distinct? There are some resemblances in the case, but the differences are many and important. If we consult the oldest and the highest authority, we do not find a single expression in the sacred narrative of the Creation giving the slightest countenance to the supposition. There, in reference to *plants*, we are told, that "God said let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind." There is not one word of single progenitors in the whole range of reference to plants and animals. Of man alone it is said, "male and female created he them." The notion of monoecious plants, originated from a single individual, and the dioecious, from a pair, must be derived from other quarters, and be supported by other evidence than the Mosaic record. There is, however, one entry in that record which places the hypothesis of specific centres of distribution in a state of peril. There we are told that "God said, behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat." This was the title of man's lordship over the vegetable tribes, limited, however, by a co-ordinate right conferred on the lower animals—"and to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat."

Keeping then these things in view, and assuming all the species of plants to be co-existing, let us suppose an ox or a horse issuing forth to satisfy the cravings even of an ordinary appetite, then every mouthful would annihilate not merely individuals, but species, or even genera, and that in a single meal. Animals have their local distribution as well as plants. Let us attend therefore, for a moment, to the number of plants in a district, and the number of herbaceous animals with the same geographical distribution. A war immediately commences, and plants are mainly saved from extermination at present by the *numerous individuals* of a species, joined to their repairing and dispersive power. When the individuals of a certain species are few, and their locality of limited extent, even a few ardent botanical students may effect under the standard of science, perhaps imaginary, what the oxen of the neighbourhood could not accomplish with their convenient knife and accommodating vasculum. It seems indeed apparent, that, for the continuance of plants, *many individuals of a species*

are required, not merely to supply food for the herbaceous animals viewed in reference to their species, but considering the numbers required to be supported by plants to serve as food for the carnivorous kinds.

Unless we can assign better proofs for the existence of specific centres of distribution than those which have yet been given, we must regard the whole fabric as visionary, and adopt in its stead the belief, unaccompanied by the difficulties of migration, that many individuals of a species were created in or near the localities they now naturally occupy.

In concluding these necessarily condensed remarks, we may venture to assert that it is impossible to contemplate plants in all their different aspects, to which we have here very briefly referred, without perceiving the importance of the science of PHYTOLOGY as a branch of general education. It unfolds to us the laws which regulate the growth and distribution of the humble plants we tread on, and which assign a place to the cedar of Lebanon and the hyssop on the wall.

- ART. IX.—1. *Progress of Russia in the East.* New Edition. London, 1853.
2. *The Russian Shores of the Black Sea, in the Autumn of 1852.* By LAURENCE OLIPHANT. Edinburgh and London, 1853.
3. *The Frontier Lands of the Christian and the Turk.* By a BRITISH RESIDENT of twenty years in the East. London, 1853.
4. *The Ottoman Empire and its Resources.* By E. H. MICHELSEN, Ph. D. London, 1853.
5. *Progress of Russia in the West, North, and South.* By DAVID URQUHART. Fourth Edition. London, 1853.
6. *Russia in the Right.* By JOSEPH MOSELEY, B.C.D. London, 1853.
7. *The Partition of Turkey, an Indispensable Feature of the Present Political Crisis.* By VERITAS. London, 1853.
8. *The Present Crisis; or, the Russo-Turkish War, and its Consequences to England and the World.* By CONINGSBY. London, 1853.
9. *The Three Eras of Ottoman History.* By JAMES HENRY SKENE. London, 1851.

Two or three years ago sanguine speculators had almost convinced themselves that a European War had become, and would remain as much a matter of history—an event belonging only to the past—as a European Plague. We had begun to flatter ourselves that both calamities were incident to a phase of civilisation which we had outgrown, and would in future be confined to the semi-barbarous East, or the yet untamed West. Many circumstances combined to rock us in the cradle of this comfortable belief. Habit had become a second nature: we had got so accustomed to the arm-chair of prosperity and peace that the mind absolutely refused to contemplate the possibility of a state of things which should ever shake us out of it. An earthquake, like that of Lisbon, laying London and Manchester in ruins, would scarcely have seemed to us more unnatural or unlikely. A generation and more had gone by since anything like a serious war had desolated the Continent. Nearly every one engaged in the last great contest had passed from the stage; the few who remained had come to be regarded rather as relics and monuments of a former world, than as agents and associates in this; the men who conduct the affairs of Europe and govern states, and frame and constitute the feelings, dispositions, and modes of thought of nations now, were trained and educated

under the shadow of a great convulsion and a long calamity, and received their early bent while the impression of a series of sufferings and sins, nearly unparalleled in history, was yet deep and vivid in their parents' minds. Then, they have seen several abortive attempts on the part of the ambitious and the bad to get up wars, crushed at once by the general combination of all the European Powers, as crimes and follies too monstrous to be permitted for a moment. They have seen every one rush instinctively, with a zeal strangely compounded of humanity and selfish alarm, to tread out the first-sparks of flame which threatened to grow into a conflagration. They have seen imbroglio after imbroglio, in which war seemed absolutely inevitable, solved by diplomacy instead; revolution after revolution, pregnant with the seeds of universal conflict, terminated either entirely without fighting, or with only a temporary and partial campaign; danger after danger, from which escape seemed impossible without a miracle, hanging over us for months, and yet leading to no catastrophic at last;—till an almost universal feeling has grown up that *some* peaceful way will be found out of every quarrel, *some* peaceful solution of every dilemma. However dark the sky, however menacing the attitude, however complicated the difficulty, we have felt almost boundless confidence in skill and good fortune combined leading to a satisfactory issue.

Now, however, this sense of security has been rudely disturbed. In spite of the most zealous and protracted efforts on the part of the greatest powers in Europe to prevent it, a regular war *has* broken out between two sovereigns whose territorial possessions are the most extensive in the world; and even while we write, the decision hangs upon a thread, whether the other states will be able to appease the quarrel, or will themselves be drawn into the vortex,—whether this flame, like so many others, will be trampled out in time, or will spread into a conflagration, in which dynasties and thrones and landmarks will be burnt up like the dry grass of the prairie. So great a catastrophe, we may be well assured, has not come upon us without mighty guilt in some quarters, and grievous neglect or compromise of duty in many others. Let us endeavour to apportion the responsibility, as far as our information—necessarily imperfect,—and our judgment—necessarily fallible—will afford us light.

Russia is of course the great criminal, the prime mover in this iniquitous affair. Notwithstanding the special pleading and partial representations of the author of "*Russia in the Right*," among those who have watched her proceedings from the commencement of the year, there can scarcely be two opinions as to the indecency and immorality of her conduct, even if we regard only the transactions in this immediate quarrel. But we entirely

refuse thus to confine our observation. The text cannot be fairly understood without the context. We must read her actions by the light which past history throws over them. We must interpret her conduct in 1853 by her conduct during the last 150 years. This last aggression upon Turkey is only the most recent step in a long march—the closing act in a long drama of conquest and encroachment. In a previous article, (No. xxxvii,) we gave incidentally a brief summary of Russian aggrandizement, which it is important to bear in mind. When Peter the Great ascended the throne in 1689, he found himself the ruler of a vast territory and a scattered population—a territory cut off from Western Europe, and hemmed in by nations far more powerful and civilized than his own—a population spare, heterogeneous, and nearly barbarous. His only outlets were to the frozen ocean and the Caspian Sea. His only ports were Archangel and Astrakan. Sweden cut him off from the Baltic. Turkey cut him off from the Black Sea. Poland cut him off from all contact with European civilisation. His whole soul was possessed with an insatiable, but not an unnatural nor an ignoble ambition. He proposed to himself to make Russia a great empire instead of a pathless and immeasurable desert. He aspired to rise from the position of the ruler of an Asiatic horde to that of a European potentate. For this purpose it was necessary that he should obtain access to the Baltic, the Euxine, and the Mediterranean. For this purpose he planned and developed that policy of territorial aggrandizement which his successors have ever since so pertinaciously and unswervingly pursued—sometimes by open war, but oftener by diplomacy and intrigue. Constantly baffled, frequently defeated, but never disheartened or turned aside, Russia has ever since that period pressed forward towards her end, with a steadiness of decision and a continuity of success which have impressed beholders with the idea of an inevitable and appointed destiny. By the treaty of Neustadt in 1721, she obtained access to the Gulf of Finland, and an outlet for St. Petersburg. How she absorbed Poland at four successive mouthfuls—in 1772, 1793, 1795, and 1815—we all know. In 1809, she took Finland from Sweden to obtain the command of the Gulf of Bothnia; and at the general settlement in 1815, risked the peace of Europe rather than surrender it, and caused the scandalous arrangement by which Norway was torn from Denmark and given to Sweden as an equivalent. By the war which terminated in the treaty of Kainardji in 1774, she gained a footing on the coast of the Black Sea; in 1783, she annexed the Crimea and the Sea of Azof; in 1792, by the treaty of Jassy, she obtained from Turkey another slice of territory, with Odessa as a port; the treaty of Bucharest in 1812 left her

in possession of Bessarabia; and that of Adrianople in 1829 gave her the mouths of the Danube, and additional territory and important fortresses on the Asiatic shore of the Black Sea. But this was not all. She held possession for some time of the Moldo-Wallachian provinces, established her own system of rule therein, and when the objections of Europe and her own prudence induced her to evacuate them, she stipulated that the institutions and form of government she had set on foot should not be disturbed; that Turkish troops should not again be allowed to occupy them; and that she should have the right (which she at once exercised) of establishing a quarantine on the Danube, thus virtually detaching them from Turkey, to whom they now owe only a sort of feudal homage.

One step only remained. Russia had obtained nearly all she wanted from Turkey, except that open seizure of Constantinople which she well knew the other powers would never permit. She had done all she could as an *enemy*: she must do the rest as a *friend*. Conquest had done its work: it must now be exchanged for the more insidious and more fatal weapon of protection. The unfortunate quarrel of the Sultan with the Pacha of Egypt, gave Russia the opportunity she so ardently desired. She saved the Porte, (though greatly weakened by the virtual severance of Egypt and Syria,) and the treaty of Unkiar Skelessee was her reward. By this treaty Turkey was bound to assist Russia in all wars, (i.e., to allow Russia to drag her into all her disputes and compel her to quarrel with all her own friends,) and Russia engaged to protect Turkey against all enemies. France and England, however, became alarmed, and insisted on some modification of this arrangement, and the "Protectorate" of Russia was not yet as perfect as she desired; and the recent demand which has brought on the present crisis was designed to complete the subjugation.*

The last proceeding of Russia was both in matter and in manner one of the most objectionable she has ever been guilty of. Stripped of all diplomatic drapery, it amounted to a virtual demand for a protectorate over all the subjects of the Porte belonging to the Greek Church, (probably ten millions†

* It is impossible thoroughly to comprehend the question without a careful study of that most invaluable historical summary "*Progress of Russia in the East*," which we have more than once had occasion to quote from in this Journal. "The process by which Russia has effected the subjugation of almost all the countries she has conquered since the reign of Peter I., has been to take them under her protection, then to foment internal dissensions, and at last to annex them to her own empire, under pretence of putting an end to the disturbances she had herself created or permitted."

† We have no accurate statistics of Turkey, but the best accounts estimate them as amounting to six millions and a half in Europe alone—or three fourths of the entire population.

in number,) an arrangement which would empower them to bring all their grievances, real or supposed, to the feet of the Czar, instead of to those of their lawful sovereign for redress, which would authorize Russia to interfere on their behalf on every occasion, and under every pretext. It was as if Austria or France had claimed the right of interposition and remonstrance, of protection and guarantee, on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland. With the known character and designs of Russia, it would have amounted nearly, if not quite, to a transfer of allegiance on the part of the vast majority of the European subjects of the Porte, from the Sultan to Nicholas; and, as was universally felt, to concede such a demand would have been a complete surrender of sovereignty and independence. It was about the most audacious step Russia had yet taken. But Turkey seemed to be in a humour for concession. France had cajoled her out of a grant of certain privileges to the Catholics of Syria; Austria had bullied her into submitting to the Montenegrin robbers; Russia herself had insisted on her withdrawing on behalf of the Greek Christians the concession with regard to the Holy Places which she had just made to the Latin Christians; England and Prussia, a while before, had insisted on her permitting the establishment of a Protestant Church at Jerusalem. Then, Austria lay at her feet, in consequence of her past services in crushing the Hungarians, and the probability that in case of war, those services might be needed again; so that the Czar might well believe that Austria would offer no impediment to his designs. He well knew, too, that England and France, to interfere effectually, must interfere in unison; and both his own diplomatists and our newspapers had told him that such unison was now impossible. He knew that our ministers all dreaded and deprecated war; he believed that our people would endure any amount of insult and ill-usage rather than endanger that tranquillity which was so essential to commercial undertakings; he imagined that Mr. Cobden and his allies would be able to raise such an outcry about the utter worthlessness of anything save peace and pence, as to paralyze all vigorous action on the part of the Government in matters of foreign policy; he was persuaded that jealousy of Louis Napoleon had tied our hands, and that indolence and wealth had subdued our spirit. He laid our vigilance to sleep by assuring us that he only desired (what the Sultan at once granted) the restoration of the former privileges of the Greek Church; and then, *while the British Ambassador was absent from Constantinople*, he sent Prince Menschikoff, an officer of high rank, in great pomp, and with a large military staff, to present his unwarrantable demand, and to *require an answer in eight days* on pain of—"the most painful consequences." He trusted

to the suddenness of the demand, the unpreparedness of Turkey, the display of insolence and power, the habit of yielding to his formidable name, and the absence of the Sultan's best adviser, for obtaining an affirmative reply. But he was mistaken. He had gone too far. The spirit of the Porte was aroused; he occupied the Principalities, but even this step failed to intimidate or overawe; the jealousy of other powers was alarmed; the concession was refused; England and France came to the rescue; time was gained; Turkey armed; and the bully, much to his surprise, was compelled to fight. He was not prepared for this; he had hoped to gain his ends by the *display*, not by the *use* of force; and the result has been, that the fortunes of the first campaign have gone against him.

Observe: we do not mean to allege that the Emperor Nicholas is a monster of iniquity because he has done all this. He has acted after his nature, and according to the traditional policy of his dynasty. He is acting in the interests and for the aggrandizement of his country, and may very possibly believe that he is acting right. We are not entitled to expect of him that he shall be so far beyond his nation or his age, as to consider the laws of eternal morality rather than the dictates of Russian interest,—to prefer justice to patriotism. We merely affirm that his objects are clear,—that he is ambitious, daring, and unscrupulous, and that it is necessary both for the interests of England and of Europe, that his ambition should be checked. Equity and policy both require that the integrity and independence of Turkey shall be maintained; and these can only be maintained by the permanent discomfiture of Russian designs. It is essential to Russia that she should possess Constantinople—if she is to be the mighty and prosperous power which it is the “fixed idea” of all her rulers to make her. It is essential to England, to European peace, to the interests of general freedom, that Russia should *not* have Constantinople; and she must, therefore, be kept out of it at any cost. Vast in her ambition, and unscrupulous in her means, she certainly is—(alas! most states are, or have till lately been so)—and we are called upon to resist her to the death. For the strong to use their strength to despoil and trample on the weak, is in the highest degree iniquitous; and this Russia has unquestionably done, whatever be the plausible disguises by which she may have veiled to herself the naked nature of the deed. But still we may treat her and regard her rather as a dangerous enemy, than as a desperate and unnatural criminal. When we see how even good men deceive themselves as to the right and just, where their own objects and wishes are concerned, we can well suppose that any sovereign

who sits upon the throne of Muscovy, may regard it as his *duty* to absorb Turkey if he can.

The position of Austria in the common guilt which has brought the calamity of war upon us, is second only to that of Russia, and originated some years ago. If she had remained the powerful and independent empire she once was, Russia could scarcely have ventured on this aggression, nor would Austria for one moment have permitted it. The two Empires are in too close contact on their eastern frontier not to be mutually jealous and vigilant over any movement which can bring aggrandizement to either. The Principalities which the Czar has seized are overlapped by the Transylvanian provinces of Austria, and are bounded by, and command the navigation of her magnificent river,—almost her only outlet. Their permanent possession would be almost as great a menace to Austria as a wrong to Turkey. But Austria, by her proceedings in 1849, had deprived herself of the power of resistance, and almost of protest. Not content with being the constitutional sovereign of a free, faithful, and warlike nation, the Emperor resolved to be its Despot and Oppressor; he broke his oaths, he violated his engagements, he trode down the liberties of Hungary; and, meeting with the resolute resistance which might have been anticipated, he was beaten, baffled, and disgraced. In order to consummate his perfidious and cruel crime, it was necessary to call in the aid of his powerful neighbour; he crouched to Nicholas that he might trample on Kossuth, and, that he might enslave his subjects, became himself a slave to his ally. He has paid dearly for the perilous and insidious assistance; he is now shackled to Russia by the double tie of vassal and accomplice; he cannot protest against transgressions which are as nothing in comparison with his own atrocities; he cannot thwart a will to which he is indebted for his empire; and the army, which might and would have been employed in protecting Turkey, finds ample occupation in watching and repressing Hungarian discontent. It is possible that now at last Austria may have resolved to join the Western Powers, as a course involving less peril than any other; but Nicholas could not anticipate such a line of conduct—nor do we believe in it; he counted, and he had a right to count, on the connivance if not the aid of the potentate whom he had rescued from humiliation and ruin; and without this calculation it is scarcely credible that he would have thought the opportunity was ripe for the audacious demands which Prince Menschikoff was instructed to prefer.

The share of France is confined to the circumstance that it was she who gave the pretext for the commencement of the entire imbroglio by endeavouring to steal a march on Russia, and pro-

curing from the Porte a firman declaring her Protector of the Holy Places. This step she subsequently withdrew, but unhappily Russia had already taken advantage of it to charge the Sultan with a breach of faith, and to demand fresh concessions and guarantees. It was a piece of petty and mischievous ambition on the part of Louis Napoleon, which has led to much evil and embarrassment. Since that, however, his conduct has been irreproachable. The moment the independence of Turkey was seriously threatened, he joined England in protesting. He was not sorry to have an opportunity for resenting the delay and want of cordiality on the part of the Czar in acknowledging his imperial title. With his usual sagacity he saw in the "position" the precise occasion which he wanted for gaining a real entrance into the magic circle of European Sovereignty, and for earning in the eyes of the world a character for dignity, good faith, pacific intentions, and generous and far-seeing policy; and he has improved it with admirable skill. He at once assured our Government of his determination to act with them throughout the whole affair with cordiality and honour, and indeed to be guided almost entirely by their advice; with every temptation to precipitate a war which would have been very popular in France, (for France has never forgotten the disaster of 1812, nor the occupation of 1814 and 1815,) and would have brought glory and therefore stability to his throne, he has patiently exhausted all the resources of negotiation before preparing for ulterior measures; he has manifested the greatest prudence, firmness, and forbearance; and though we do not suppose that in his heart he cares one fig for Turkey, or regards the affair in any other view than as it may be made subservient to his own moral "rehabilitation," yet if his motives had been the highest and most unselfish in the world, it is difficult to see how his proceedings could have been worthier or more unblameable.

England, we grieve to say, has been far more guilty in this matter. Her share dates like that of Austria from some time back, and as in all free countries must be divided between the government and the people. Her first great mistake—so great as to be nearly a crime, certainly a deplorable dereliction of duty—was in permitting Russian interference to crush Hungary in 1849. If she had then—as we have always contended that she ought—said firmly and resolutely to the Czar: "Leave Austria to fight her own battle and perpetrate her own sin; your sympathies are with her—ours are with her victim; both are natural—let us both suppress them; but if you interpose on the one side, we will give all the aid we safely and conveniently can to the other; we will not see a brave and independent nation, with a guaranteed and long-descended constitution like our own, trampled down by

the coalition of two despotic empires in spite of treaties and in defiance of decency and right :”—if England had held this language, who can doubt that Russia must have held her hand, and that Hungary would have now been either independent, or again united to Austria under material guarantees which would have placed her liberties beyond future danger ? In either case Turkey would have been safe, and England would now have been spared the imminent prospect of a war. In the former case Hungary—naturally sympathetic with Turkey—would have constituted a powerful and warlike ally, whose forces, in addition to those of the Porte, the Czar would have hesitated to encounter. In the latter, Austria would have been powerful enough and free enough peremptorily to have forbidden the meditated wrong. Our second error—though here we speak with more diffidence, as not yet being possessed of all the facts necessary for forming a decided judgment—seems to have consisted in not assuming from the first opening of this dispute a higher tone, a more indignant language, and a prompter action. We do not appear to have succeeded in at once impressing Russia with the conviction that, come what might, we would not permit her encroachments to proceed. We remonstrated, we negotiated, we moved our fleet—but we have been in the habit of doing all these things, *and doing nothing more* ; and the Czar evidently supposed that all he needed was to be bold and insolent enough, and that we should then counsel our ally to yield or at least to compromise the quarrel on unfavourable terms. Our proceedings at Vienna gave too much countenance to this surmise. Our representatives there, by some most unaccountable incapacity or oversight, did certainly recommend Turkey to consent to terms which would have been to her as fatal and dishonouring as Russia could have desired. Our uncertain action and timid and hesitating language evidently satisfied Russia that she had nothing ultimately to fear from us, and thus unintentionally drew her on to a position from which retreat seems nearly impossible. Had we plainly and boldly assured her in the first instance that we would advise Turkey to no substantial concession, and that we would if needful support her by men and money in an armed resistance, no one who is acquainted with the mingled daring and pliability of Russian policy can doubt for a moment that she would have retracted and retired. She may have believed we were in earnest ; but she did not believe that we were ready to enforce our remonstrances by ulterior measures. She believed, and she had but too much reason to believe, that war was an eventuality which we were not prepared to encounter—that we in common with the rest of the Powers of Europe, preferred peace to justice and to character.

Not only our government, but our press, and a certain energetic section of our politicians, are to blame for this. It is a common remark, that if Lord Palmerston had been at the Foreign Office, the Russian aggression would not have been attempted. We believe this,—not that we imagine Lord Palmerston's successors are in reality one whit less anxious or less resolute for the honour and the influence of Great Britain than himself, but that they are less experienced, less mistrustful of Russia, less vigilant to mark beginnings, less prompt and susceptible to protest and to repel tentative advances, than he would have been;—and that Russia knew this and counted upon it. And we cannot forget that for some years back two-thirds of the daily press at least, have been perpetually assailing Lord Palmerston with every weapon of malice and misrepresentation—some, as the betrayer of continental liberties—some, as the secret tool of Russia—some, as the impertinent intermeddler with what did not concern us—all, as the man to whom England owed her almost universal unpopularity. We know no public man who has been the object of such continuous, virulent, contradictory, and, we believe, generally undeserved abuse. It is no wonder that such a pelting storm should—not have driven him from office, he was too valuable and important a statesman for that, but—have made his colleagues feel that the direction of foreign affairs had better be committed to some less decried and hated individual. The press, therefore, which drove Lord Palmerston from the Foreign Office, must be held, in a great measure, responsible for the war in the East.

The press of England, too, has incurred this grave responsibility by another fault.* It is notorious that the consideration which, beyond all other, encouraged Nicholas to precipitate his bold aggression, was his conviction that, while Louis Napoleon was Emperor, an alliance, or even a cordial understanding, between Great Britain and France was impossible. What gave rise and certainty to this conviction? The language of English

* The most powerful journal in this or any country has yet a further sin to answer for. We cannot and ought not to forget the support it has all along given to Russian designs by its pervading tone and its open language—often vacillating and contradictory, but invariably immoral. At the commencement of the affair, it encouraged Russia by writing of the Ottoman empire as one that was inevitably falling to pieces, that it was hopeless to save, and absurd to attempt to prevent from being absorbed by its greedy neighbours—in fact, that the sooner it was partitioned among them the better. Later on, it abused the Turks in unmeasured terms for daring to stand upon their independence, to think and act for themselves, and to strike a blow in their own defence. It treated their resistance as a crime, and hinted plainly enough that, since they refused to accept the oppressive proposal which emanated from Vienna, and had been hailed with triumph by Russia, we ought either to leave them to their fate, or to join in compelling them to submission. Of course "The Times" is neither in the pay nor in the interests of Russia; but if it had been, it could not have aided her iniquitous designs more effectually or unscrupulously than it has done.

journals. With scarcely an exception, they opened out against him as a monster of perfidy and crime whom it would be insanity to trust, and dishonour to act with; who could not retain his throne for more than a few months at the outside; who was the tyrant and jailer, and not the elected, of the people on whom he trampled; and to whom, as he kept down the nation by the army only, a foreign war would be impossible and suicidal. Day after day they poured forth diatribes against him which Nicholas might well imagine would exasperate him beyond the limits of endurance, and render all reconciliation, friendship, and alliance hopeless.

Lastly, not only the press but the politicians of the peace and ultra-commercial school, have much of the present embarrassment and the coming war to answer for. In the first place, they have led the Czar to believe that this nation was so enamoured of repose, so passionate for peace, so bent upon adding to its wealth and consolidating and extending its prosperity, that no affront, or injury, or menace—nothing, in fact, short of actual invasion—would arouse it to meet the fatigue, to encounter the hazards, or to endure the cost of war;—that no questions of foreign policy, at all events, would be regarded as worth so much trouble or so much expenditure. The unworthy ravings of Mr. Cobden and his more pardonable associates about universal peace; their constant attacks on the estimates for national defence; their declamations about economy and reduction,—were sweet but most delusive music in the ears of the ambitious potentate of the North. Mr. Cobden's language in particular must have been delightful to him, when exaggerating the worthlessness of the Ottoman power, and the folly of Great Britain in imagining that she had any interest whatever in preventing Nicholas from transferring his seat of government from the Neva to the Bosphorus. Unhappily, too, these writers and haranguers had done much in persuading not only Nicholas but our own government, of this inordinate determination of the people to remain at peace under all circumstances and at any price. For years back, and often at the most critical periods, the foreign action of our ministers has been hampered, their language rendered timid and hesitating, and their remonstrances emasculated and made ineffective to a degree which it is impossible to estimate, by the conviction thus forced upon them, that if they spoke out too loudly against flagrant wrong, or menaced too boldly against insolent aggression, or protested too vehemently against stupid cruelty, the nation would not back their language or make good their threats. However sacred or just their cause, however sad the case of the victim on whose behalf they interposed, they were compelled to measure their language and proceedings, not only by their own

feelings or wishes, but by what the country would enable them to justify and carry out. And how could a foreign minister speak with decision and effect, if he and those whom his words were to hold in check both know or believe that the nation which he governs will not allow him to go one step beyond the poor artillery of notes and protocols? We cannot say, but there is One who knows, in how great measure the ruin of Hungary and the suppression of Italian liberties must be laid at the door of our ultra-liberal press and our radical politicians.

So much for the causes of the war in the East: we will now say a few words as to its prospects. By the time this Number is in the hands of our readers, they will probably know more than we do at this moment as to the issue of the first campaign. At first success was on the side of justice. Fortune went against the Russians everywhere. The Turkish troops crossed the Danube in several places; they defeated their antagonists three successive days at Oltenitza, apparently with ease, certainly with little comparative loss; they then recrossed the river at their leisure, and without molestation; and they have entrenched and still maintain themselves at Kalafat on the Wallachian side. In Asia, their victories were still more signal and important. They took the most important fortress on the Russian frontier, (St. Nicholas,) and retained it in spite of several attempts on the part of the foe to regain it; they have stormed several smaller strongholds; and, though they have since encountered several reverses, it is obvious that on all occasions they have fought well—both as to skill, courage, and pertinacity. To set against these successes an overwhelming Russian squadron of *line-of-battle* ships has destroyed a Turkish squadron of *frigates* and *transports*, but has suffered very severely in the conflict. The balance is considerably on the Ottoman side as to material advantage, and still more so as to moral gain. Still we do not venture to pronounce from this—the mere opening of the struggle—what will be the probable result of a prolonged war. We will not hazard any positive predictions. So far, no doubt, the Turks have displayed unwonted vigour, and the Russians unexpected feebleness. But we must bear in mind that Nicholas, though the aggressor, *was not prepared for war*; he had expected to gain every thing by bullying, had no idea of being called upon to fight. He made a great *display* of force, by way of terrifying his antagonist into submission, but was taken by surprise when compelled to back his haughty words by actual deeds. Therefore what has happened now is no sure augury of what will happen when he really girds on his armour for a serious contest.—But let us give a few moments' attention to the relative

strength, resources, and position of the two empires—as far as our limited means of information and our contradictory informants will allow us to discover them. We shall gain much aid from Mr. Oliphant's valuable and interesting work, and some also from "The Frontier Lands," and from Dr. Michelsen's Statistics, —checked and assisted by what we have been able to learn from residents in both countries, and from our own slight acquaintance with one of them.

Few things are more difficult than to obtain any trustworthy and certain view as to the real power and resources of Russia. It is a country the interior of which is little known, and rarely visited by European travellers; residence there by such is not encouraged either by the climate or the government; the language is a great impediment; and we are therefore apt unconsciously to take our impressions from the statements which Russian writers and emissaries have been so diligent in disseminating through the rest of Europe, and which, as might be anticipated, are especially unreliable. It is of course the interest, and has long been the practice of the Russian government, to spare no pains to represent itself as eminently enlightened and overwhelmingly powerful, to make the semblance do the work of the reality, to substitute diplomacy and intrigue for armies and campaigns, and to use the tongue and pen as cheaper and more effective weapons than the sword;—so that it is most difficult at the present day to decide whether Russia is a giant or only a bully,—whether she is really enlightened, or only astutely barbarous. We incline strongly to the latter opinion;—probably only a protracted war can shew whether we are right or no. There can be no question as to her being a colossal power; her territory is enormous, and a great proportion of it singularly fertile; her rivers are about the longest and most navigable in Europe, and give (or would give, at a slight expense for canals) access from nearly every part of her dominions to the Baltic, the Euxine, and the Caspian. She might, if she pleased, be a highway for much of the produce of Europe. She has fine ports; she has valuable mines; she has every variety of climate. Her natural resources, therefore, are immense—but they are deplorably undeveloped. Her despotic government, her narrow and jealous policy, her feudal organization, sap her energies and are fatal to her progress. The climate is genial throughout most of the south, the soil eminently rich and productive; and it might be made to yield nearly every agricultural product in the greatest abundance and of the finest quality;—yet the wool is coarse, the wine is poor, and the corn even is now surpassed by that of Turkey. Russian agriculture is of the very worst description—a mere scratching of the

surface; the implements of tillage are rude and scanty, and the means of transport wretchedly tedious and inadequate. And no wonder: the curse of feudalism broods over every estate. The peasant is not only brutally ignorant, but is a hopeless serf; he cultivates his lord's land ill, because he cultivates it without knowledge, without zeal, and without remuneration; he cultivates his own land ill, because he can only cultivate it when his lord does not demand his services; he cannot carry his labour from districts where it is a drug, to districts where it is paid in gold, because he is not free, and because government formalities throw every conceivable obstacle in the way of his locomotion. The roads are few and bad; canals are scarcely heard of; one railroad only is in existence; the traffic on the great rivers are carried on by tow-boats instead of steam-tugs, and the mouths of these great highways are allowed to become blocked up by mud and ballast; while the custom-house and all other officials act as if their orders were (there is reason to believe they are) to put every possible impediment in the way of European commerce and free intercourse with foreigners.

"All these ports (says Mr. Oliphant) suffer alike from the absence of any means of inland communication. The wheat exported from Taganrog arrives for the most part in carts drawn by oxen, the rate of travelling not exceeding fifteen miles a day—the roads being quite impassable, excepting during a few summer months. Thus it is apparent that the foreign market does not depend for the supply of grain so much upon the state of the crops in the interior of Russia, as upon the state of roads to the sea-coast.

"Altogether, though the ports on this coast manifest the most determined disposition to prosper in spite of everything, I doubt whether the combination of natural and political disadvantages with which they are beset will not ultimately prove insurmountable; for besides the want of water and the want of roads, they have just experienced a new deficiency in the want of labour. This seems rather an odd complaint for a country containing fifty millions of inhabitants, a considerable proportion of whom are in great poverty; but it is absolutely the case, that those of the scanty population inhabiting the steppes near these ports, who will give themselves the trouble to work, have occasionally earned as much as one silver rouble a day each.

"The thousands half-starving in many parts of the country, who are not altogether bound down as serfs to a particular locality, are unable to migrate to this land of plenty, on account of the system which obliges them to invest their all in a passport to bring them here, and when they have made a little money, to spend their savings in bribes to government officials, for more passports to take them back again to their own district, from which they may not be absent above a limited time; while the journey there and back would most pro-

bably occupy a considerable period, if it were not altogether impracticable for persons in their condition. But in addition to these political hindrances, the besotted and apathetic disposition of the Russian peasant, at any rate, permits him to rest content with what is barely sufficient to keep body and soul together; while in the numerous fast-days which his religion imposes, he finds abundant excuse for gratifying his indolent nature. Thus do the Government and the Church of Russia combine to retard the advancement of the country; and instead of fostering those vast resources with which nature has blessed the land, they seem intent only upon adding to the obstacles which she has opposed to its prosperity. What reasonable motive can we assign for those enormous guild-dues to which merchants are subjected, and which seem imposed expressly to discourage the existence of such useful members of society? or those immoderate duties upon all foreign goods, which are tantamount to a prohibition of civilisation, while they raise the price of freight to other parts, since stones are the most profitable cargo which a ship can bring to a Russian coast?—or those quarantine regulations and police dues which must be designed to prevent vessels from coming at all, even loaded thus?”—(Olyphant—*Shores of the Black Sea*, p. 178.)

But, it will be observed, Russia has always directed her attention to political rather than commercial supremacy, and has sought rather extension and aggrandizement without than the development of internal prosperity, and the question, therefore, which it is important to solve at present, regards rather her military power than her progress or her wealth. We might reply that the former can scarcely be either great or durable without the latter, —but let us look the matter in the face. There can be no doubt that the armies of Russia are unparalleled in numerical force, and might, if occasion required, be still further increased. It is true that the Imperial Guards and the troops which come directly under the Emperor's eye in the North of Russia are fine men, admirably disciplined, well-found, and well-manœuvred. It is certain, that in the Napolconic wars, the Russians fought with great obstinacy and valour, and till the English appeared upon the stage, were the most formidable antagonists the Emperor of France had to encounter. But troops on paper are not always troops in the field; it is not the Household Brigade that fight upon the frontiers; and the soldiers of the outlying provinces which the Emperor never sees, are a very different class, and in a very different condition, from those which he personally reviews and examines; and the armies that fought in Hungary and in the Caucasus are very unlike those which, after long training and under the leading of Alexander himself, traversed Germany and pitched their tents round Paris. What the real character of the fighting portion of the Russian troops—those at a distance from Moscow and St. Petersburg—is now, we may learn from the

fact that army after army has been swallowed up in the Circassian war, and yet made scarcely any impression on those hardy mountaineers; that in every war thousands upon thousands of them are always in the hospital before a single shot has been fired; that in the last Turkish war those who fell by disease outnumbered five to one those who fell by the sword; that even now in the Principalities, 20,000 are prostrated by want and fever; that the Russian Commissariat is, and has long been, a by-word of infamy; that Russian magazines are generally empty and Russian hospitals always full; and, in fine, that, by universal admission, (about this there is no dispute,) the Russian soldier, brave and hardy as he is, is the worst fed, the worst lodged, the worst clothed, and, in all respects, the worst cared for in Europe. Putting aside the regiments immediately in contact with the Emperor and raised from his own serfs—who are enthusiastically attached to him—the Russian soldier has no zeal for the glory, no interest in the object, ~~no~~ taste for the hardships, no pleasure in the enterprise of war; he is forced into the service, torn from his family for life, drilled by the knout, neglected by his officers, fed on black bread, always without comforts, often without shoes. How could such troops be expected to make head against Schamyl and his gallant warriors? And need we wonder while we read that at Oltenitza their officers had to drive them on to the attack with menaces and blows, and that the prisoners who were taken entreated (as is said) to be permitted as a mercy to enlist in the army which had captured them?

The real weakness of the Russian army consists in the wretched state of the Commissariat department; and this arises from the same pervading vice which is the canker, the characteristic, and the ruin of the civil as well as the military service of that ill-governed country—the universal dishonesty of the *employés*. It is one system of jobbing, bribery, corruption, and peculation, from the highest to the lowest, in every quarter and in every branch. Every public servant is so ill-paid, that he *must* rob if he is to live,—so that each man lives upon the one above him or below him, and all live upon the Emperor. The custom-house officer maintains himself by connivance at infractions of the law; the Judge is paid for his decisions; the Governor grows rich by plunder; the army contractor embezzles the stores, and generals and colonels wink—for “a consideration”—at the scandalous and fatal drain. The Emperor pays for all: the soldier obtains nothing. We believe there is no exaggeration: all travellers and all residents agree as to the universal and heinous corruption. Indeed, how should it be otherwise? There is no middle class who pay the taxes and insist on knowing how they are expended. There is no free Press with its penetrating and omniscient vigilance, to

compel honesty and drag offenders to light and retribution. *There is only one eye over all:* and that eye can of course see only a small corner of this vast empire. What the Emperor sees to, or can visit, is well done: everything else is neglected and abused. It is the common and inevitable story, wherever you have centralisation and barbarism combined. Let us again extract a confirmation or two from Mr. Oliphant.

"The hard service which has reduced so many of the handsomest ships of the Russian navy to this condition, [that of hulks,] consists in lying for eight or ten years upon the sleeping bosom of the harbour. After the expiration of that period, their timbers, composed of fir and pinewood never properly seasoned, become perfectly rotten. . . . The wages of the seamen are so low—about sixteen roubles a year—that it is not unnatural they should desire to increase so miserable a pittance by any means in their power. The consequence is, that from the members of the Naval Board to the boys that blow the smiths' bellows in the dockyard, everybody shares the spoils obtained in an elaborately devised system of plunder, carried on somewhat in this way:—A certain quantity of well-seasoned oak being required, government issues tenders for the supply of the requisite amount. A number of contractors submit their tenders to a board appointed for the purpose of receiving them, who are regulated in their choice of a contractor, not by the amount of his tender, but of his bribe. The fortunate individual selected immediately sub-contracts upon a somewhat similar principle, arranging to be supplied with the timber for half the amount of his tender; the sub-contractor carries on the game, and perhaps the eighth link in this contracting chain is the man who, for an absurdly low figure, undertakes to produce the seasoned wood.

"His agents in the central provinces, accordingly, float a quantity of green pines and firs down the Dnieper and Bay to Nicolacff, which are duly handed up to the head contractor, each man pocketing the difference between his contract and that of his neighbour. When the wood is produced before the board appointed to inspect it, another bribe seasons it, and the Government, after paying the price of well-seasoned oak, is surprised to find that the 120 gun-ship, which has been built of it, is unfit for service in five years. The rich harvest that is reaped by those employed in building and fitting her up is as easily obtained; and to such an extent did the dockyard workmen trade in Government stores, &c., that merchant vessels were for a long time prohibited from entering the harbour. I was not surprised, after obtaining this interesting description of Russian ingenuity, to learn that out of the imposing array before us [at Sebastopol] there were only two ships in a condition to undertake a voyage round the Cape."*—*Shores of the Black Sea*, p. 255.

* Of course this system is occasionally detected and individuals punished. One memorable instance is mentioned by Oliphant, in the case of the Governor of Sebastopol, whose atrocities in this line were brought to light by a sudden visit of

The army arrangements do not seem to be much better or more honest.

"But in addition to the natural impediments presented by the configuration of the country, the absence of roads, and the rigour of the climate, all military operations are crippled by that same system of wholesale corruption so successfully carried on in the naval department. Indeed, it would be most unfair if one service monopolized all the profits arising from this source. The accounts I received of the war in the Caucasus, from those who had been present, exceeded anything of the sort I could have conceived possible. The frightful mortality among the troops employed there amounts to nearly 20,000 annually. Of these, far the greater number fall victims to disease and starvation, attributable to the rapacity of their commanding officers, who trade in the commissariat so extensively that they speedily acquire large fortunes. As they are subject to no control in their dealings with contractors for supplying their regiments, there is nothing to check the ardour of speculation; and the profits enjoyed by the Colonel of a regiment are calculated at £3000 and £4000 a-year, besides his pay. It is scarcely possible to apprehend at a glance the full effect of a process so paralyzing to the thews and sinews of war; or at once to realize the fact, that the Russian army, numerically so far superior to that of any European power, and supplied from sources which appear inexhaustible, is really in a most inefficient condition, and scarcely worthy of that exaggerated estimate which the British public seem to have formed of its capabilities. It is not upon the plains of Krasno-Selo, or Vosnesensk, amid the dazzling glitter of a grand field-day in the Emperor's presence, that any correct notion can be formed of the Russian army. The imperial plaything assumes a very different appearance in the remote Cossack guard-house, where I have scarcely been able to recognise the soldier in the tattered and miserably equipped being before me, or on a harassing march, or in the presence of an indomitable enemy."—*Ibid.* p. 261.

We have no doubt this is quite true. Still, it must not be forgotten, that in a prolonged war, and with power, honour, and existence at stake, much of this would disappear; for then the Emperor would take the field in person and with the *élite* of his troops, would inspect everything in person, and soon (for the time) compel his subordinates to do their duty, and be faithful to their trust.

There is yet another source of weakness inherent in the Russian Empire. That vast State is surrounded on every side by nations whom she has exasperated, impoverished, and robbed, and is in a great measure composed of the spoils which she has

the Emperor. But it is only when the Emperor sees and acts in person that these discoveries and retributions take place; and the Emperor cannot of course know one case in a million.

torn from them. She is a patchwork of filehed and unamalgamated materials. Her frontier provinces are filled with injured, discontented, hostile populations, whom, being unable to reconcile to her rule, she has endeavoured to enfeeble and to crush, and many of whom await with more or less of patience and desire, the blessed day of emancipation and revenge. Sweden has never forgiven her the loss of Finland, nor do we hear that the Finlanders are enamoured of their new connexion. The Germans of Livonia are not yet thoroughly amalgamated; and what Poland is and yearns to be, we need not say. The ruined Boyars of Bessarabia curse the day which transferred them to the Russian sceptre; and the Danubian Principalities tremble at the prospect of a similar fate. The Tartars of the Crimea, (who still, in spite of every effort, constitute half the population of that province,) though languid and inactive, are quite unreconciled, and would gladly shake off the yoke of their infidel conquerors, and resume their ancestral grandeur. The Don Cossacks hate Russia with a perfect hatred, for she has done nothing for their country, and yearly drains off their youth to be sacrificed in a war which they detest. The Circassian tribes have never acknowledged her dominion, or submitted to her forces, and the once Persian and Turkish provinces which lie beyond the Caucasus are still Turkish or Persian at heart and in religion. Since the great Roman Empire, probably no State ever enfolded so many bitter enmities within its embrace, or was girt with such a circle of domestic foes. This, combined with the other causes we have mentioned, must render the position of Russia a most critical one at all times, and one of incalculable peril in case of a disastrous war with any of her neighbours. Three unfavourable campaigns would probably arouse against her all the provinces which she has conquered, and show of what loose, confused, and mutually repellent materials her colossal monarchy is composed. All these things considered, it is by no means unlikely that if the present war continues, she may turn out to have been a gigantic imposition. Vast means and materials of strength she undoubtedly possesses, if she had the wisdom to develop her resources by an enlightened policy, or to attach her subjects by a just and generous treatment;—but both these things have been as far as possible from her ideas. Therefore we think it not unlikely that when tried by the severities of a real struggle, she will prove weak to a degree which will astonish those whom she has so long duped and dazzled; weak from her unwieldy magnitude—weak from her barbarous tariffs and restrictive system—weak from the inherent inadequacy of her one-eyed despotism—weak from the rottenness of her internal administration—weak from the sup-

pressed hatreds she has accumulated round her—weak in every thing save her consummate skill in simulating strength, and persuading her enemies that she is irresistible. If she succeed now, we believe it will not be because Turkey is conquered in fair fight, but because allies and antagonists combine to alarm her into a conviction that she must be conquered if she perseveres.

It must not be supposed that by these remarks we think lightly of the real power of Russia if once fairly put forth in a struggle for empire or for national existence. On the contrary, we deem her invincible on her own ground, and in her interior. A European war might tear away many of her recent undigested acquisitions, but could not harm her life. Men she has without limit; and she would spend them all in a contest of life and death. Money she could probably secure from some quarter or other; and whenever practicable, she would make war support war. She will probably be always worsted in a first campaign, owing to her scandalous commissariat and the universal corruption and peculation which eats away her resources; but as soon as the struggle became serious and vital, and the Emperor girded on his armour for the strife, we should probably see the scale turned against any *single* antagonist by the mere brute force of numbers, and the hardihood and insensibility which distinguishes the Muscovite population. We have no doubt that united Europe—if Europe be united—will be able to beat Russia back if her aggressions become intolerable enough to induce a general appeal to arms; but we greatly doubt whether her diplomacy may not succeed in preventing this union; and whether we may not awake to our danger when it is too late, and find both that Russia is overwhelmingly strong, and that it is we—our neglect, our timidity, our clumsiness, our tardiness and languor—that have made her so.

The real strength and resources of the Ottoman Empire are peculiarly difficult to ascertain. We have much conflicting assertion, but little authentic or reliable evidence. Till very recently everything has tended to confirm the popular impression, that the Turkish power was decrepit and moribund, without vitality or vigour, and doomed to speedy extinction, or, at least, to an early expulsion from Europe. It has suited the policy of writers and talkers in the interest of Russia so to represent it; Greek merchants settled in England have held the same language, partly from the influence of old antipathies and partly prompted by ambitious hopes of one day supplanting the Ottomans at Constantinople; and most travellers seeing only the surface, and hearing only what came to them from Franks, have fallen into the same depreciatory and contemptuous tone. The diplomatic and warlike proceedings of the last thirty years have

contributed to the same impression. The Porte has been alternately bullied and protected by all European powers. It has been assumed that she could not defend herself, and subsisted only upon sufferance and by the mutual jealousy of her neighbours. The fortunes of war, too, have gone against her. A quarter of a century ago, her navy was destroyed by England, Russia, and France, at Navarino, and Greece was torn from her after a long and sanguinary conflict. Then Egypt rebelled, and became nearly or virtually independent—the Sultan only being rescued from the most imminent peril by the assistance of his most insidious foe. The war of 1829 with Russia was terminated by the submission of the Turks to the disastrous and humiliating treaty of Adrianople; and the whole of the recent history of their unfortunate country alternates between the humiliation of defeat and the humiliation of protection. It has always been suffering either from encroachment or from patronage. The idea of the Ottoman Porte being able to defend herself, or judge for herself, or show a will of her own, has, till a year or two ago, and except by a few who were looked upon as visionaries, been scouted as absurd—and is so still by many. Others, however, who have watched her more closely, have been aware of a most momentous change which has come over her of late years—of a fresh spirit pervading her internal administration—of a new-born vigour presiding over both her military and financial policy, which has arrested the progress of her decline, and gives hope of a future very different from the past. *No one knows this better than Russia.* She has long been aware of the growing strength which Turkey has gathered from her manifold reforms; this knowledge has stimulated her intrigues, redoubled her hostile energies, and made her precipitate the measures which have brought her into her present false position. She saw that if she did not strike soon, the great prize which she had been playing for for centuries might escape for ever from her grasp. Pozzo di Borgo, in a confidential despatch, which we quoted in our last Number, assigned *the improvements and revivification of Turkey as a ground for hurrying on the war*; and we prefer the testimony of Russia in favour of her enemy—thus secretly and therefore honestly given—to any other.

It is useless, and would be both tedious and deceptive, to attempt to prove dogmatically the means and energies of the Ottoman Empire by a formidable array of figures, notwithstanding the opportunity of giving such, which Dr. Michelsen's book and Mr. Skene's pamphlet have furnished to us. *Accurate statistics are unknown in Turkey.** We can only state generally,

* Nothing shows this more clearly than the discrepant estimates of the population of European Turkey. Dr. Michelsen gives it as 15,500,000; Mr. Bowen, in

that a great change has of late been wrought in nearly every department. The war with Egypt, and that with Russia in 1829, took place at a time when the destruction of her old military forces, the Janissaries, and the utter unpreparedness of her new recruits, left her really without any available army. She has now a force, including a well trained reserve, of 400,000 men. The Turks were always brave, and they are now well disciplined, and for the most part well armed and well commanded. Her artillery is known to be in excellent order, and to be managed by European officers of first-rate skill. Her regular soldiers are well fed and well cared for; and to crown the whole, the utmost zeal for national independence has been aroused in the remotest corners of her dominion, and every province is pouring in its contingent with promptitude and ardour. Then the *Tanzimat*, or great constitutional reform of 1839, which conferred equal civil rights on all the subjects of the Porte, and substituted law for mere despotic will, laid the foundation for a new order of things, which, when completed, will place Turkey far ahead of Russia in all essential civilisation. It is not yet universally established, but is gradually making its way from the centre outwards; it secures property, and endeavours to secure a fair administration of justice; new courts of law have been created in several of the great towns, and the evidence of all men is received without distinction of creed; and such great satisfaction has been given by these new tribunals, that petitions have lately been forwarded to Constantinople praying for their extension to other districts. The revenue is also augmenting, and now amounts to £8,000,000 sterling, but this is still Turkey's weakest point. However, the recent abolition of the old detestable system of "farming the re-

his "Mount Athos, Thessaly, Epirus," on the authority of a careful estimate by a Professor Philetas of Corfu, gives it as 8,500,000.

Creed.	Michelsen.	Bowen.
Mahometans,	3,800,000	1,750,000
Greeks and Armenians,	11,370,000	6,390,000
Catholics,	260,000	260,000
Jews,	70,000	100,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	15,500,000	8,500,000
Wallachia and Moldavia, .	4,000,000	3,000,000
Bosnia, &c.,	1,400,000	880,000
Roumelia,	2,600,000	1,930,000
Servia,	1,000,000	910,000
Bulgaria,	4,000,000	560,000
Thrace,	1,800,000	1,020,000
Islam,	700,000	200,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	15,500,000	8,500,000

venue" gives great hopes for the future. All these facts may be gathered from the publications we have placed at the head of our paper; and we think they fairly warrant the statement of Lord Palmerston, that there is no country in Europe which has made such rapid strides in civilisation and strength during the last thirty years as that very Turkey which we have been accustomed to regard as in the very last stage of decrepitude and dissolution. Whether her progress is sufficiently consolidated and advanced to enable her to make head single-handed against her colossal rival, if the Emperor should put forth his whole powers, and take the field in person, we cannot affirm, and we will commit ourselves to no predictions.* But we entertain the most sanguine hopes that if the present war issues in the discomfiture of Russia, either with or without the intervention of the Western Powers, and is terminated by a treaty whose conditions shall leave Turkey free to pursue her new career of improvement undisturbed by Muscovite intrigues, she will, before another twenty years have elapsed, be in a position to hold her own against any enemy that is likely to attack her. Her conduct throughout this whole affair has raised her character incalculably in the eyes of Europe. She has displayed wonderful forbearance, dignity, wisdom, skill, and vigour. She refused with spirit an insolent and inadmissible demand, even when unprepared for an attack; she shewed herself willing to negotiate and anxious to avoid a rupture if it could be avoided with honour and with safety; she set about preparing for the worst with an energy and determination which amazed both friends and foes; she refused to be cajoled or bullied into a shallow and fatal compromise; her diplomatists at once detected and exposed the insidious meaning and concealed injustice of terms which, we are ashamed to say, the diplomatists of the Four Powers had been deceived into proposing; when she saw how little she had to hope from either the sagacity or the firmness of her allies, she resolved to rely upon herself alone; she insisted on Russia's retiring from the dominions she had invaded, but allowed her time to do so; when she declared war at last, she did so in dignified language and with humane provisions which might read a lesson to many a Christian state; and when she commenced hostilities she did so with courage, spirit, vigour, and success. Indeed, from the outset she has acted like a Christian, when her adversary has behaved like an ungovernable Pagan; and of all the powers of Europe, she is, we feel bound and proud to say, the only one who has acquitted herself in all points well—the

* Turkey's deficiency in financial resources will, we fear, prove a serious difficulty. A liberal subsidy, or a large loan guaranteed by Great Britain, would be, very probably, a turning point in the struggle.

only one who has made no blunder, neglected no duty, committed no injustice.

We must now say a few words on a subject on which the greatest and most mischievous misapprehension has prevailed,—the relative *desirableness*, namely, of Russian or of Ottoman success. We had been told so long that at last we had ended in believing it, that it would be a blessed day for Europe, as well as for Turkey, when that misgoverned country passed from Mahometan to so-called Christian rule—when her oppressed subjects and her fertile soil cast off their old incubus and reposed under the dominion of a power which would respect the rights of the one and develop the resources of the other. The Sultan was represented as all that was narrow and imbecile, and the Czar as the personification of enlightened liberality. The Christian subjects of the Porte were depicted as groaning under the cruelties of the Mussulman, and crying night and day for the protection of their “co-religionists” in Russia, and as only waiting to enrich all Europe by their enterprise and industry till they were emancipated from a hated and benumbing thralldom. So incessantly had this language been repeated in every form and by every organ, that we had become almost content to connive at the designs of Russia as a small evil which would purchase a great good, and to regard her present piratical aggression as one of those exceptional cases in which (to use the words of Burke) “morality submits to a suspension of her own rules in favour of her own principles.” The *Times* spoke of the absorption of Turkey in Europe by Nicholas and Francis as a consummation, if not “devoutly to be wished for,” at least to be neither repelled nor prevented; and the Highway Robber who puts the name of “*Veritas*” on his title-page, coolly and strongly urges the immediate junction of the Four Great Powers in his plan for partitioning the Ottoman empire among them, appends to his pamphlet a coloured map, shewing how easily and beautifully it might be done, and laughs to scorn any scruples which might be felt on the score of either decency or honour. To such ignominy have we been brought by misconception of fact and disloyalty to the eternal laws of political morality! We entirely deny the false assumptions which have been thus put forward to justify and prompt to heinous crimes. It may be true enough that Syria and Egypt would benefit by being transferred to England, and that Asia-Minor would benefit by being transferred to France, as *Veritas* proposes; but the same might be said with equal truth of Italy and Spain; probably also of Austria and Russia. But that the European inhabitants of Turkey would gain by exchanging the dominion of the Sultan for that of either

Czar or Kaiser, we more than doubt; and that the Christian subjects of the Porte either need or desire the protection of Russia, we believe to be utterly and scandalously false. We are quite certain that for many years back they have endured less persecution, and stood less in need of protection against their rulers, than Dissenters from the religion of the State have done either in Austria, Prussia, Tuscany, Spain, or Rome. It is long since any maltreatment of Christians, as such, has occurred in Turkey, except occasional outbreaks of fanaticism, got up for the most part by foreign, generally Russian, intrigue. We affirm, without fear of contradiction, that every plea arising from reported intolerance and alleged religious sympathy, brought forward to justify Russian interference on behalf of the Christian subjects of the Porte, might be adduced with far greater cogency and justice to warrant our interposition in favour of the Protestants of Italy or Spain, Prussian interposition in favour of the Protestants of Austria and Hungary, Austrian or Roman intervention on behalf of the Catholics in Russia, aye, even, we believe, Turkish intervention on behalf of those members of the Greek Church who are Dissenters in Russia, but orthodox in Christian Turkey. For the Christian subjects of Turkey are *not* "co-religionists" of the Czar of Russia any more than the members of the Church of England are the "co-religionists" of the members of the Church of Rome. The Greek Church in Turkey, and a portion of the Greeks of Russia, acknowledge the Patriarch of Constantinople as their head; the Greek Church in Russia acknowledges only the headship of the Czar; and the former well know, from the treatment of their *real* "co-religionists" in Muscovy, what would be their fate if the Czar ever became their ruler. They are in no haste, therefore, to exchange the somewhat contemptuous toleration of the Sultan for the relentless persecution which would await them at the hand of the Emperor of Russia.*

* "A lie has been placed on the lips of Europe in the word *Russo-Greek Church*. The one is a form of revealed religion; the other is the worship of a man. In the official Church of Russia the Czar is 'viceregent of God on earth,' and as such is the object of FAITH and WORSHIP. The disease that preys on the vitals of the Russian empire is religious dissent, originating in this sacrilege. The Non-Conformists maintain the original faith, such as it was when the Russian Church was in communion with that of Constantinople. The only name they give themselves is that of 'Old Believers,' (in Russian, *Starovisai*;) they are therefore identified with the 12,000,000, or 13,000,000, of Christian subjects of the Porte in Europe; they are objects of the most bitter persecutions on the part of the Russian Government; and the familiar term which they apply to the Emperor is 'Antichrist.' Were there no Mussulmans in Europe, and were Russia free to extend her dominion to the Ionian Sea, we should find her at once engaged in the most furious of religious wars with old subjects and new, amounting to 20,000,000."—*Progress of Russia in the South and West*.

If any one desires to know how invariably "the protection of their brethren in

Sometime perhaps—and we would fain hope at no very distant day—we may have reached such a point of enlightenment that the dissentients in every land and from every creed shall by common consent be placed under the ægis of the joint civilisation of the world; when religious persecution shall be held a crime against humanity, and, like piracy, cognizable by the universal law of nations; when interposition to prevent any man from being molested for his creed shall be a recognised right, provided for by treaty and sanctioned by the general conscience of the world—just as remonstrance against unnatural and horrible barbarities might be now. But till we have reached this point, and till we are prepared to carry out in all countries the same just and humane principle, we can admit no religious plea for Russian interference with the subjects of Turkey that would be denied and resented if put forward by Spain on behalf of Irish Catholics, or by England on behalf of Tuscan Protestants.

Nor can we allow any weight to a consideration which has lately been obtruded into the Eastern question, with an intention which is but too manifest. We are reminded ostentatiously that the Russians are Christians, and that the Turks are “Unbelievers.” We cannot do better than refer to the answer which this reminder recently received in one of the few publications that has been uniformly consistent on this subject. “Such language (it was said)—especially when taken in relation to the inference it is meant to suggest—can scarcely be regretted or deprecated too earnestly. We know by long and sad experience that few things can be more disastrous than the introduction of religious animosities into political discussions. That religious principles should preside over all our deliberations, and that religious sentiment should pervade and imbue the mind of every statesman as of every citizen, is a maxim which cannot be too strongly stated or too rigidly adhered to; but that sectarian sympathies or antipathies should be permitted thus to influence our national actions or our

the faith” has been made the pretext for Russian encroachments on the liberties of neighbouring States, we recommend him to read the “Declaration” of Catherine II. to the Diet of Poland, (20th April, 1766,) on behalf of the Greeks in that Catholic Kingdom,—and the Report of the Diet on the seditious movements which Russia had excited there in 1789. And if any one wants information as to the treatment which Roman Catholic dissenters meet with from the Greek Church,—from that same tolerant Emperor who now interferes to protect his co-religionists from the intolerance of the Mussulman,—he may hear of something to his advantage by perusing (in the valuable “Recueil des Documents”) the “Allocution” of Pope Gregory in the Secret Conclave, 22d July 1842, and the Petition of the “Isted Greeks” of the province of Uszacs, in 1835, remonstrating against the to which, as Dissenters, they were subjected. He will find enough to him that Christians of any non-conforming denomination are safer in life, limb, liberty, and property, under the Infidel Sultan, than under either Czar, Emperor, or Grand Duke.

foreign policy, is a proposition which cannot for one moment be defended. It is long since these considerations have guided either our wars or our diplomacy; and to put them forward now is to risk throwing us back whole centuries in civilisation. There is nothing which so effectually clouds the judgment, heats the passions, disturbs the vision, and perverts the morality of men and nations, as the introduction of sympathies and antipathies of creed into discussions which ought to be decided on the broad grounds of justice, and the simple dictates of duty and of honour. It is difficult enough even now to see clearly what ought to be our course in the present accumulation of confusions: if we once allow the recollection that our allies are Mahometans, and that our enemies call themselves Christians, to enter on the stage, it will soon become impossible to see our way at all.

In the first place, it is not true, in the sense in which it is ordinarily alleged, that the Russians are our *fellow*-Christians, and that the Turks are "Unbelievers." Both, according to our view of their creed, are "*mis*-believers." We very much question whether, if the matter were truly understood, we should not find that English Protestants, and Scotch Protestants still more, have at least as much sympathy of faith and feeling with the Mahometan monotheist as with the benighted votaries of the Russian Church. The Turks pray to God only—"the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob:" the Russians pray to a host of saints who are an abomination in our eyes. The foundation and first point of all three communions—the Mahometan, the Oriental Christian, and our own—are identical. We all believe in one God, and in Moses, David, and Jesus Christ as his inspired prophets; the last we, in common with the Greek, regard as our Divine Saviour. Both Russian and Turk go further: the latter add Mahomet—the former add St. Nicholas, St. Catherine, and an interminable calendar of canonized priests and worthies. It is sad and unsatisfactory to be called upon thus to cast the balance between two false and faulty theologies; but we will appeal to any earnest Protestant who has lived in Turkey, whether he did not feel as much prompt and natural religious sympathy with the follower of Mahomet, whose simple faith is comprised in two formulas—prayer to God and charity to man; who never fails night or morning, at business or at meals, when the Muezzin sounds the hour for his devotions; who never passes a mendicant without bestowing alms upon him "for the love of God," however poor he may be himself,—as with the so-called Christian of the Oriental Church, whose whole religion is a mass of fasts and superstitious ceremonies, and who is enslaved by a priest almost as ignorant as himself.

In the second place, in the affair immediately under discussion, it is the Turk who has acted like a good Christian, and the Russian who has acted like a rapacious infidel. And how can a potentate claim our sympathy on the ground of a common creed, while trampling underfoot every commandment of that creed, and acting in the most flagrant contravention of its spirit? "By their fruits ye shall know them." And we have the highest authority for embracing in the closest bonds of fraternity those of every nation who "walk humbly" in the presence of God, and "do justly" in the face of man, and for refusing to recognise as Christians all those, whatever may be their profession or their name, who are "oppressors, extortioners, unjust." "In that day many shall say, Lord, Lord, have we not preached *in thy name*, and in thy name cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works? and then will I profess unto them, *I never knew you*: depart from me, *ye that work iniquity*." Nor is the present the only instance in which, in the Ottoman dominions, heathen crimes are perpetrated by nominal Christians, and Christian duties are reserved for the practice of the "Unbeliever." No one who has been at Jerusalem at Easter, or has read the accounts of those who have, can fail to be aware of the scandalous scenes transacted there nearly every year; how the Greek and Latin Christians fight round the very sepulchre of their professed Lord and common Saviour, till blood flows in torrents on the sacred floor; and how the astonished and disgusted Ottomans have to provide a regular police for the occasion, to compose the feuds of the "True Believers," and to separate the infuriated Christian combatants.

Less than any other country can England listen to any pretexts based on the alleged incongruity of a Sovereign of one religion holding dominion over subjects of a different faith. She, while Protestant, governs millions of Catholics, thousands of Greek Christians, millions of Mahometans, Hindoos, Buddhists, and heathens;—and promptly and haughtily would she resent the interference of any sympathizing Potentate, and loudly would she declaim against the insolence of any foreigners, who should intimate that she did not govern all these miscellaneous religionists justly, or that there was any unfitness in her holding sovereignty over them. No! Do not let us tolerate in the case of others what we would not tolerate in our own. Let us sympathize with and uphold Christianity in every land and by every lawful and wise means within our power; but let it be the Christianity which is in truth and not in form—the Christianity which obeys the precepts of Christ, not that which only names his name—the Christianity which does justice and loves mercy and repels crime,—not that which makes its profession a mere cloak

and screen for deeds which bespeak a very different inspiration, and should be called by quite another name.

Apart from the religious allegation, there is assuredly no point in which the lands now under the sovereignty of the Sultan would benefit by the overthrow of his dominion, if either Russia or Austria are—as they would be—his successors. As assuredly there is no desire among the dwellers in those lands for such a change. Any such wish which may once have existed from time to time, when fomented by the intrigues of the sleepless aggressor, has long since disappeared before the improvements in the Ottoman Government, and a fuller acquaintance with the detestable realities of Russian rule. What indeed is there in the relative systems of the several candidates for empire, that should incline the balance against the actual possessors? We are not going to paint Mahometan sway in any very glowing or attractive colours. It is ignorant, semi-barbarous, often locally and individually oppressive. Justice is weak, slow, often unattainable, frequently attainable only through bribery or menace. There is little attempt to develop enterprise or stimulate industry, little respect for the pursuits of commerce, little reverence for the arts of peace. But the Ottoman Government has one great merit,—great enough to counterbalance many faults: *it governs very little*. It seldom interferes with the plans or pursuits of its subjects. A wicked or rapacious Pacha, in the remoter provinces more especially, will often oppress and extortionize individuals among those subject to him; but, on the whole, the people are left pretty much to themselves, so long as they pay their taxes, and conform to the law. In no country in Europe, except perhaps Switzerland and England, are municipal institutions so *real* or so effective as in Turkey. They more nearly resemble those which we found existing in India. The tax to be paid by each district or village is fixed, but its apportionment is left to the inhabitants themselves. The leaden, penetrating, omnipresent centralisation of Russia and Austria is unknown. The Turks are not like the Germans, Italians, and Muscovites, ground down under the heavy burden of a vast army of officials. There is *individual* tyranny and injustice, but tyranny and injustice are not *systematized*. Robbers abound,—both authorized and amateur ones,—and the Government is generally too feeble effectually to put down either; but the latter class abounds almost unchecked both in Italy and Greece; and the whole bureaucracy of Russia consists of the former. Then the administration of Turkey is now fairly embarked on a career of earnest improvement,—which certainly cannot be said of either of her greedy neighbours. No! her government unquestionably is bad, we admit; but the deadening, benumbing,

iron rule of Austria and Russia would be far worse. And who that has read in De Custine, Oliphant, or the "British Resident in the Frontier lands," the picture of Muscovite administration in the unhappy territories subject to its sway,—the corruption, the oppression, the insolence, the severity, the stupidity, which blight their happiness and annul their resources,—who that has seen even a small portion of the pervading espionage, the brutal despotism, the imbecile cruelty, the incurable narrowness, with which Austria treads down all the nobler life and all the healthier energies of Galicia, Bohemia, Lombardy, and Hungary, would for the wealth of worlds lay upon their conscience the sin of bringing fresh millions under such ruinous and besotted sway? God forbid that England should aid such consummation, even by a word. The barbarism of Oriental ignorance is bad enough, but the barbarism of *soi-disant* civilisation is far heavier and more fatal, because more penetrating, more subtle, immeasurably more powerful, beyond calculation more hopeless and incurable. The first may retire before the gradual influence of contact with European art and knowledge; the latter will give way before nothing short of a bloody and unsparing revolution. The Turks *do not hinder* the culture and enlightenment of their people; there is nothing to prevent the Greek and Slavonian subjects of the Sultan from becoming so prosperous, so well-educated, so civilized, in short, that no barbarous government could wrong them or keep them down,—or could remain barbarous when their influence was brought to bear upon it. But Austria and Russia, as is too well known, deliberately and on system employ all the resistless enginery of Church and State to repress mental development, to crush intellectual freedom, to render impossible all real enlightenment or lofty culture,—to retain, in a word, their wretched people in that low and level condition of mediocrity and torpor which alone is compatible with a leaden autocracy like theirs.

The European subjects of the Porte know this well. They are aware that under the Sultan they enjoy a substantial freedom which it would be madness to hope for under either Emperor or Czar. If they wish to travel for improvement, or for commerce, or for pleasure, they have not as in Russia to ask formal leave from the sovereign, and pay besides, a large sum yearly for the permission. If they wish to read and learn, they do not find themselves thwarted and fettered as in Austria, by orders at the custom-house to prohibit the entry of all books fitted to stimulate inquiry, or cultivate genius, or excite ambition, or reward labour. There is no Index Expurgatorius in Turkey. The Sultan never confiscated a treatise on astronomy or politics, like the Pope of Rome, or shut up a Protestant

school like the King of Naples, or imprisoned a Christian for reading the Gospel of St. John, like the Grand Duke of Tuscany. Is it a sway like that,—like the one which has paralyzed Italy, and crushed Hungary, and desolated Gallicia, and depopulated the Crimea and the country of the Cossacks, and ruined Bessarabia, and trampled upon Poland, that we would extend over the fertile and sunny lands which lie between the Danube and the Archipelago, and for which so glorious a future may be anticipated? The inhabitants of those lands dread and deprecate any such transfer, as the worst of threatened evils. For they know full well that, if it was become needful for their progress or their comfort to shake off the Mussulman dominion, they could do so without much difficulty, as soon as wealth and civilisation had made them powerful; but that, if once incorporated either with Austrian or Muscovite territory, they must write over the mausoleum of their hopes the despairing words which Dante saw emblazoned over the gate of Hell,—

“Lasciate ogni Speranza, o voi ch’ entrate.”

Of late years the inhabitants of Moldavia and Wallachia have had abundant opportunities of contrasting the two Sceptres. The Principalities have been often occupied by the armies and officials of both governments, sometimes separately, sometimes conjointly; and the impression left has been most painful and decisive. The Turks have behaved well, and paid for every thing they wanted, though in their own territory. The Russians have been insolent and oppressive, and have lived at free quarters, though in a foreign land. Every administrative or material improvement planned in those provinces has originated with the Ottomans, and been thwarted by the Muscovites. Hence the former have always been welcomed as liberators, and the latter received as enemies. Everything that jealousy and stupidity combined could do to injure those districts, to impede their prosperity and prevent their tranquillity, has been done by the agents of the Czar. His usual good policy has here abandoned him; and the result is, that a degree of hatred has been generated in the minds of all classes there, which—if ever unfortunately those provinces should be incorporated with Russia—will make them as difficult to govern as Poland, and will probably compel Nicholas to make them a desert in order to keep them in peace.

To obtain an idea of what Turkey and Europe in general might look for from such a transference as has been suggested, let us state a few facts regarding the commerce of the States in question, and regarding that of the Danube in particular. The tariff of Turkey is notoriously the most liberal in the world;

those of Russia and Austria notoriously the most oppressive and prohibitory. Turkey admits every article of import at a duty of three per cent. ; Russia and Austria (besides a number of internal impediments) charge duties varying from five per cent. to *sixty*. The consequence has been a great and steady increase of our commerce with the former country, and as great and steady a diminution of our commerce with the latter. Our exports of British produce to the Adriatic ports of Austria, (the only ones she has,) were not published separately from those of the rest of Italy till 1846, when they reached £721,981 ;—in 1852, they were £674,423. Our exports to Russia, on an average of 1840 and 1841, were £1,605,000 ;—in 1852, they had fallen to £1,099,917. Our exports to the Turkish dominions, including of course Moldavia and Wallachia, have in the same period been steadily increasing. In 1840, they were £1,440,592 ;—in 1851, £3,548,959 ;—in 1852, £3,816,580. *They are now double those to Austria and Russia together.* Nor does it affect the matter one iota, that a great portion of this is a mere transit trade : Austria and Russia do not even allow us this ; and it matters nothing to us what countries ultimately consume our produce, provided it be allowed to reach those countries without difficulty. The country which debouches by Odessa, finds a formidable rival in that which debouches through the Danube. Bulgaria and Wallachia (not to speak of Hungary) produce just the same articles of commerce as the southern provinces of Russia—hides, tallow, wool, hemp, and above all, grain of every description. “Every ton exported from the Danube was, therefore, a ton less exported from Odessa or Riga.” It became, in consequence, an object of great importance to Russia, not only to obtain an influence over the Danubian Principalities, so as to quash and impede their industry by every means in her power, but also to obtain the entire control of the navigation of the great European river. This she effected by a treaty with Turkey in 1829—*permitted by Austria and England*—which surrendered to her the delta of the Danube in sovereignty, and authorized her, on sanitary pretexts, to establish a quarantine on all vessels entering that river, as well as on all communications between the two banks. How we ever tolerated such an encroachment is inconceivable. What has resulted from our stupidity, is at length beginning to be understood. Russia has made use of her power, as it might have foreseen she would, to impede the commerce of the Danube as much as possible by harassing and costly regulations, and every species of petty and dishonest vexation, and not content with this, has actually *permitted and aided the gradual filling up of the mouth of the river*, which the Turks always kept open, so that the depth of water, which used always to be sixteen

feet, has now dwindled to eleven feet. This is beyond question; it has been more than once stated and proved; it was admitted by Lord Palmerston in the House of Commons in July last, and the mean motive of it was not denied; it is done in direct infraction of the treaty which bound Russia to keep the mouth of the Danube in its former navigable condition—an obligation which she verbally admits; it is continued purposely and systematically in defiance of frequent representation and remonstrance; and no decided steps have been taken to compel a performance of contract, or to retract a fatal concession. In fact, painful as it is to say so, the destruction of the navigation of the Danube has been steadily aimed at by Russia, and passively connived at by England. Russia has not only established her quarantine establishments at its mouth; she intercepts all vessels—ours among the rest—and sends them to perform quarantine at Odessa (!); she even is allowed to levy dues and charges in London and Liverpool amounting to nearly £100 a cargo on all vessels proceeding to the Danube, which may wish to avoid this detention. The nature of the difficulties she throws in the way of our commerce with the Danubian Provinces in order to divert it to her own dominions, may be gathered from the following statement of a London broker published in the “Progress of Russia in the South and West:”—

“Galatz and Ibrail (*Turkish*) on the Danube are free ports. At Odessa there are great inconveniences from quarantine, heavy charges, uncertainty and venality, and your business is not discharged without some payments, as bribes, which a master must know how to manage; nevertheless we can take charters from Odessa at from 10s. 6d. to 3s. a quarter less than from the few ports on the Danube. These additional charges are incurred partly from the state of the river, partly from the nature of the climate, and from Russia. The lighterage is effected under contract with Russian boats, so that at times they charge what they like, and vessels are exposed to great risks. The climate in autumn is so bad, that great expense is incurred for medical aid; a vessel recently came home, having lost all her crew except two. The other charges are for quarantine, which is vexatious, and in the last degree hampering.”*

If after considering these facts, any of our countrymen should still be advocates for surrendering Turkish provinces to Russian

* This way in which the pretext under which Russia has established her quarantine and contingent impediments, as really regarded by herself, may be learned from the following statement of Mr. Urquhart, which we presume may be relied upon. “I visited Silistria when occupied by the Russians; ‘Travellers’ had to perform fifteen days’ quarantine; but Russians were liable to infection only on a graduated scale; ten days for a private, five for a captain; a field officer had three; a superior officer none. Foreign despatches were fumigated with much care; Russian despatches were utterly neglected.”

possession, or even to Russian "protection" and control, we can only say that we think Nicholas ought, in mere common decency of gratitude, to present them with the order of St. Catherine.

We cannot wonder at the nervous anxiety exhibited by all the Great Powers of Western Europe to prevent the dispute between Russia and Turkey from culminating in a war, nor their desire, on almost any terms, to hush up and terminate that war now that it has actually broken out. There are stronger motives for this anxiety than even dislike of the disturbance of prosperity, or dread of the horrors of a sanguinary campaign. Statesmen of every nation are too well aware that a prolonged contest can scarcely be confined to two belligerents alone, and that it must open questions and risk eventualities, neither of which they are prepared to face. The motives of their present zeal are partly humanity, partly laziness, partly timidity, and partly perplexity. These considerations have unfortunately proved stronger than love of justice, or that wisdom which looks to future tranquillity rather than to present truce—which is less anxious for an immediate armistice than for an enduring peace. They led to our earnest advice to Turkey not to declare war. They led to the hurried, clumsy, and discreditable Vienna Note, and to the indecent violence with which some of our influential writers urged its submissive acceptance by the Porte. We cannot wonder at this feeling: the eventualities of the present position of affairs are undoubtedly serious and complicated enough; and it is not surprising that statesmen who cannot see their way through them, who have not nerve to look them in the face, and who are not clear as to the line of policy which they ought, or may wish, to pursue when these eventualities arise,—should endeavour to stave them off by every means in their power. Still, this is not wisdom; it is not duty; it is at best but the weak craft of the procrastinator, or the craven manoeuvre of the ostrich. Sooner or later these embarrassing questions must be met and understood, and our maxims of conduct with regard to them decided and made known. Let us intimate, as briefly as we can, a few of the possibilities which seem "looming in the future." There are *four* several contingencies to be considered.

In the first place, the four Great Powers may, as was a month ago said to be the case, combine cordially and honestly to compel Russia to desist from her pretensions, and relax her grasp on Turkey. If resolved to do so, *and agreed upon the conditions on which to do so*, their course is clear and their success would be easy, immediate, certain, and signal. Russia could not and would not resist them for an hour. Surrounded as she is by incorporated foes, harassed by the Circassians, assailed by the Turks, with a

combined English and French Fleet blockading, or in possession, of Sebastopol, and preventing all reinforcements from traversing the Black Sea to her outlying armies; with British men-of-war closing the Sound against her navy and her commerce, and, if need were, 50,000 French troops landed in Bessarabia or Wallachia; with Austrian and Prussian forces ready, if needed, to assist the "Holy Alliance,"—Russia would be annihilated if she ventured to continue the war. The allies have it in their power, therefore, at once to terminate the war, and to dictate the terms of peace; and it rests with them only to dictate terms which shall save them from the necessity of even again having to interpose, and shall close for an indefinite time, if not for ever, "the Eastern question," which has so long and so repeatedly menaced and disturbed the tranquillity of Europe. They have only to speak plainly and to act promptly and decisively. Let them do this, and negotiate a peace on the following terms:—The abrogation of all existing treaties which give to Russia any influence or privilege in Turkey not possessed by the other powers; the total and *bona fide* retirement of all Russian agents from the Principalities, and the cessation of all Russian control over or interference with their administration; the restoration to Turkey of the mouths of the Danube, or if not that, the construction (and placing under the guarantee of the Law of Nations, like the great rivers of Europe) of a ship canal from the bend of the Danube towards the north to Kustendji on the Black Sea, so as to restore that river to its ancient channel, and remove its navigation from Russian control; the cessation of the power which Russia now possesses under the Treaty of Adrianople, of placing a quarantine on vessels and passengers entering the Danube, or crossing from Bulgaria into Wallachia and Moldavia; and, finally, as a protection and guarantee for these acts of justice, the opening of the Black Sea in time of peace to the fleets of all nations, and in time of war to those of all nations with whom Turkey herself is at peace.—Nothing short of these stipulations will disarm Russia of her power over the Porte—at present to thwart her prosperity—ultimately to seize her capital. To insist on anything less would be to stultify our efforts, and to throw away our opportunity. That these terms have not already been dictated and enforced, is a striking proof of the wonderful skill and power of Russian diplomacy, which is far more to be dreaded than Russian arms. The latter *might* not be able to beat Turkey single-handed—certainly would not be able to beat her with England and France as vigorous and sincere allies; we are by no means sure that the former will not prove an overmatch for all the four Powers combined.

In the second place, if the agreement of the four Powers to

enforce peace on the basis we have specified, should be found impossible—if Austria, acting under Russian influence, should induce her associates to propose terms of accommodation to Turkey which she cannot and ought not to accept—namely, the *status quo*—(and this, we greatly fear, will turn out to be the present position of the case)—and if, in consequence of the refusal of the wronged party to submit to wrong, her allies should withdraw, and leave her to fight single-handed a righteous battle with a gigantic foe,—then two consequences may, and probably will arise, which we do not believe our statesmen have adequately considered,—if indeed they have entered into their minds at all:—*First*, A grievous blow to British influence in the East; and, *secondly*, A glorious opening for the establishment of American influence in Europe. In Asia, Great Britain and Russia are rivals; they are the only European powers whose names are heard there; any ascendancy gained by the one is so much of station and control lost to the other. We have perpetually to combat Russian influence and Russian intrigues in Persia, in Afghanistan, and even on our own Indian frontier; and, as might be expected from the superior skill, consistency, and pertinacity of her diplomacy, we generally combat at a disadvantage. Now, in the East, moderation, forbearance, a cautious and Christian policy, is never understood. Patience is always considered to be fear; submission to insult, or acquiescence in discomfiture, is always attributed to weakness. If a nation shows any disinclination for war, it is taken for granted that she is unprepared for it; if an ally is abandoned, or a pretension withdrawn, it is interpreted as conscious inability to support the one or to maintain the other. Insolence and audacity are invariably accepted as indications of strength, and Orientals will always side with the strongest. With them might is right. It is well known there that England is the ally and that Russia is the enemy of Turkey; nice distinctions of diplomacy and cautious considerations of the complicated interests of European politics are not comprehended; it has been seen that we have sent our fleet to Constantinople to aid the Sultan, and to check the aggressions of his enemy; and if we retire without having done this effectively and intelligibly,—if we have allowed his navy to be destroyed under our own nose, and have contorted ourselves with inquiring particulars and succouring the wounded; if we have stood tamely by while Russia has seized the Principalities, and have acted only by remonstrances and protocols; if we have only sent negotiators to make terms, while Russia has sent armies to enforce claims,—the nations and sovereigns of the East will look only at the broad facts and ignore all qualifying details, and will draw the substantially correct conclusion, that we have been

baffled, and that our rival has won the day. The star of Russia will culminate, while that of England will decline in the East; tribes and chiefs who would have been our very humble servants if we had peremptorily waved back the Czar from the shores of the Danube, or burnt or blockaded his fleet in Sebastopol, will now take their cue and receive their impulses from St. Petersburg, and fancy that they may treat us with insolence, neglect, and insubordination; and it will be well if we do not find that our anxiety to avoid a war in Europe, where our victory would have been certain, signal, and immediate, has entailed upon us more than one conflict in Asia, where we have no allies to aid us, and where triumph may be more doubtful, and will assuredly be more costly. If, as is rumoured, Persia has already declared war against Turkey, we may accept this as an augury of the future, and the first fruits of our trifling, halting, and hesitating policy.

Again, the Americans, as is well known, have no special liking for the Russians; they are jealous of Great Britain; they have had more than one "tiff" with Austria; they are deeply interested in the gallant struggle which Turkey is now making for her independence; and above all, they sympathize warily and enthusiastically with the Hungarians, and are fully aware how closely Magyar and Ottoman interests are bound up together. They long for an opportunity of striking a blow against despotism, and on behalf of republican institutions; they are full of zeal for the spread of liberty and popular rule throughout Europe; and, imagining they have a "mission" to fulfil, they believe that a more just, glorious, and hopeful opportunity was never presented to them than the present. The retirement of England and France from the scene, to leave Turkey to such fate as her own unaided resources could command, would probably be the signal for the immediate interference of our Transatlantic brethren, not, perhaps, as a nation, but as volunteers. If Hungary were to rise, their intervention would be certain; and Hungary *would* rise if American aid were known to be at hand. We can state positively that men, money, and arms are all ready—waiting and anxious for an opening. The whole nation, as is well known, (and the government of the United States must soon follow the nation,) is longing to obtain a footing in the arena of European politics; and Turkey abandoned by her old allies, and left to the mercy of the great despot of the world, would offer too tempting, too honourable, and too just an occasion to be neglected. Nor could we say them nay; we have pronounced Russia to be wrong, and we could not interfere to prevent assistance being offered to the right. And we may be well assured that if the Americans did come upon the stage, their proceedings

would be conducted in a very different mode, and guided by a very different spirit from our scrupulous and timid policy—always hampered by traditional ideas, always bound down to official forms, always restrained by the fear of too signal a success, always confused, thwarted, and enfeebled by ulterior considerations. Now, should we be wise to throw open to the United States such an honourable opportunity for becoming a European Power, for planting a republican flag in the Mediterranean, for doing a duty from which we have shrunk, for reaping glory which ought to have been ours?—We are accustomed to speak of the Americans as a commercial people, always counting the cost, governed exclusively by the “almighty dollar.” This is not so. Numbers among them have more wealth than they can use, and long only for distinction. As a people they are essentially ambitious, propagandist, and vain-glorious; military fame, it has long been seen, is the road to high office and to public estimation; and the admiral, the general, aye, or the private individual, who should plant the national flag on the batteries of Sebastopol, or drive the Russians out of Bucharest, would, beyond all question, find the Presidential chair ready cushioned for him when he returned home. Nor could their success be very doubtful. They are the best sailors in the world, and among the hardiest soldiers; they could soon get together a navy powerful enough to destroy that of Russia; they have boundless wealth, and would not spare it were the national zeal once fairly roused; and, as we once before remarked, they present the most formidable combination of qualities which it is possible to encounter—the utmost hardihood of savage life with the most unbounded resources of civilisation and science. We ought to curb and baffle Russia, therefore, if only to anticipate America in doing so.

There is yet a third political combination in which the Eastern quarrel may “eventuate.” Austria and Prussia may be too much under the control of Russian influence, or may sympathize too keenly with the *arrières pensées* of Russian despotism, or may discern too strong a probability of their future need of Russian aid, to be willing to concur in forcing upon the Czar those terms of accommodation which England and France deem just and indispensable. They may therefore draw off, and remain really and nominally neutral, or join the Czar avowedly or virtually. It does not very much matter which, for Polish and Hungarian movements would almost inevitably—were the struggle once fairly commenced—speedily scatter all pretended neutrality to the winds. Russia, Prussia, and Austria would then be ranged on one side—England, France, and Turkey on the other. We should feel no sort of objection to such an array. Such an

alliance would not only leave the ultimate issue of the contest no longer doubtful, but would enable us to terminate it almost before it was commenced—*provided our hearts were in the struggle, and we were prepared for the steps necessary to ensure success.* Such prompt action as we have already specified in the Baltic, on the Danube, and in the Euxine, combined with a peremptory and decided note addressed to Austria and Prussia, informing them that if they gave the smallest aid, open or secret, to Russia—nay more, if they did not instantly and publicly renounce her cause, and honestly abide by their renunciation—England and France would not only not discourage, but would aid the patriots of Italy, Hungary, and Germany, to regain the constitutional liberties which have been torn from them,—would at once place an easy victory in our hands if those powers succumbed; a glorious and pregnant victory if they resisted. That they would at once submit, we have no doubt whatever: they dare not for their lives encounter another war of peoples against sovereigns, *with Great Britain and France as allies and patrons of the former.* The Emperor of Austria, the Viceroy of Lombardy, the tyrant of Hungary, the brutal Elector of Hesse Cassel, the vacillating and slippery King of Prussia, all the statesmen who have aided their oppressions, all the priests who have stimulated and sanctioned their excesses, know too well and dread too cravenly the terrible accumulation of vengeance that awaits them at the next uprising, not to purchase tranquillity at the price of any humiliation or of any sacrifice. If servility to Russia induced them to run the risk of such a catastrophe, the war might be a long and a terrible one, but it would be the grandest and most sanitary hurricane that ever cleared the moral atmosphere of a trampled and disordered world; and when the storm was over and the *débris* swept away, the only despotic throne left standing would be that of Russia, and she would be shorn of her prestige to terrify, and of her power to injure and overshadow Europe.

But are the two Western powers prepared to take this necessary step to ensure success? Will the ruler of France and the aristocratic statesmen of England ally themselves with the oppressed patriots and republicans of Europe? *Do not Russia and Austria feel confident that they will not, and draw boldness, security, and insolence from the conviction?* Is there not something so incongruous and startling in an alliance between Louis Napoleon and Lord Aberdeen on the one side, and Kossuth and Mazzini on the other, that politicians brought up in the old school and accustomed to stand upon the old ways will never be able to embrace it or conceive it? There is too much reason to fear this. Our statesmen, almost to a man, while desirous of the establishment of constitutional liberties upon the Continent, dread

republican institutions almost more than they detest despotic ones. They feel as if there would be something both dangerous and degrading in fraternizing with insurgents and democratic chiefs. The feeling is natural; but in this case it is demonstrably a weakness and an absurdity. For, if they ever have to act hostilely and decidedly against Austria and Russia, (and we assume that justice, necessity, and national honour have now driven them to this,) *this much deprecated and unnatural alliance will be forced upon them without their choice and against their will.* If they prosecute the war with the vigour and energy necessary to ensure success, (and if they do not, the national outcry will soon show them that it were better for them that a millstone were hanged about their neck, and that they were drowned in the depths of the sea,) they will find themselves by the mere force of circumstances fighting side by side with Hungarian and Italian rebels—or patriots, as we shall then call them. The moment the war assumes a character of duration, and Austria is dragged in ostensibly or really on the side of Russia, the whole Magyar nation will be up in arms. They, like ourselves, will be fighting on the side, and against the enemies of Turkey; they will aid us—we shall have to support and acknowledge them; we shall have, *bon gré mal gré*, to concert measures with their generals, and to furnish arms and succours and subsidies to their chiefs; we cannot pretend either to be cold or blind to forces which are every day advancing our cause, beating our foes, effecting a diversion in our favour. Then, when Hungary is up, and Austria is busy, and Russia is beset on all hands, Italy and Poland will seize their opportunity and strike their blow; and we cannot, whatever be the predilections of our statesmen, be fighting against Austria on the Danube, and aid or connive at her progress on the Po, the Arno, or the Tiber. War, like misery, “makes a man acquainted with strange bedfellows.” Why, then, since this alliance will inevitably be forced upon us by a war, should we not employ the menace of it to prevent war or to close it at once and on our own terms? It has indeed been hinted, that we have held out something of this sort to Austria as the obvious prospect before her if she sided with Russia; and that she has replied by asking, “Will you guarantee me *against* these things if I join with you?” We think it more than probable she *has* asked this question; what the answer of England has been, we can only conjecture. It can NOT have been in the affirmative. England *cannot* have said, “In that case we will aid you to keep down your Hungarian and Italian subjects;” for no statesman, if he has stooped to such infamy, would have dared to do so in an official despatch, which, however secret, would have certainly leaked out, and which, if once known,

would raise against him a howl of detestation such as no man would have the hardihood to encounter. She may, indeed, have said, "In that we will observe a complete and honourable neutrality in the event of any internal strife in your dominions, as we hitherto have done; or, if you will give reasonably free institutions to Italy, and restore to Hungary her former constitution, and honestly abide by these, we will become your faithful and cordial allies, and discourage all insurrectionary and democratic movements." More than this it is impossible she can have said. It is impossible that for the sake of baffling one injustice she should have made herself a party to another—that in order to repel one tyrant and aggressor, she should have bargained to aid and sanction another and a worse.

A somewhat different consideration may have withheld her from menacing Austria with these ulterior dangers as plainly as she might have done, and from prosecuting her quarrel with Russia as peremptorily and resolutely as she ought to have done. A general European war would, as we have just seen, involve a rising and probably an entire revolution of the whole Italian peninsula, and would therefore necessitate a settlement of the affairs of Italy, in the details and perhaps even the general direction of which England and France might find it impossible to agree. We have no further interest in Italy than that she should be prosperous and free; France, however, has always been jealous of her influence in that country, and always desirous to extend it; and she might choose to interfere where we wished her to abstain, or might interfere in an exactly opposite direction to our wishes. Louis Napoleon, too, is understood to have his own plans as to a new dynasty at Naples, and a new arrangement in the northern states. We might be disposed to aggrandize Piedmont, and France to discourage that augmentation. Then the disposal of the Roman State would present an almost insuperable difficulty where Protestant and Catholic Powers were the contracting parties. Or, if we were mutually to consent to leave Italy to arrange her own affairs and fix her own governments and divisions, how would the Republicans of Lombardy and Romagna, the despotic lazzaroni of Naples, and the Constitutional monarchists of Piedmont, be able to settle their differences without an amount of anarchy, confusion, and bloodshed, which would compel our intervention in the name of humanity and for the general peace of Europe? And finally, would not Austria, shorn of Lombardy and Hungary, be so much weakened relatively to France, and France so much strengthened relatively by the liberation of Italy, as to awaken our hereditary fears for the equilibrium of Europe? Have we so far outgrown our traditional notions of foreign policy, as to see this change without jealousy or alarm? or ought we so to see it?

Without following up these speculations as we might do had we space, we have said enough to show that a war once fairly entered upon between Great Britain, France and Turkey on the one side, and Russia, Austria and Prussia on the other, would inevitably become not a mere war of crowns but of nations and opinions—possibly even a war of nations against crowns—and would open questions involving the entire resettlement of Europe. Before it was ended, alliances and combinations might have changed more than once; friends might have become divided and foes have become joined; dynasties and forms of government might have been overthrown and replaced by their antagonists and opposites; old wounds might have been re-opened, old chimeras re-aroused, old failures re-attempted; and the wild confusion of fifty years since once more sweep away the landmarks of Europe. It is natural enough that all men who have not nerves of iron, and who remember that fearful time, should shrink from opening the floodgates of such an incalculable deluge; it is natural especially that those should shrink from it who have no earnest wishes, no enthusiastic hopes, no clear or well-defined line of policy chalked out in their own minds,—who do not know what port to steer for, what issue to desire, which of two perils they are most anxious to avoid; it is most natural of all that those should shrink from it whom age has taught to dread evil rather than to be sanguine after good, to distrust all brilliant promises and magnificent visions of a regenerated era, and to sicken at the prospect of the dreary desert of chaos and bloodshed which lies between the dreamers and their goal. We believe it is to this feeling more than any other—to a sense of *unpreparedness* on the part of all our statesmen to face and grapple with the vast problem which shakes its warning finger and lifts its menacing voice in the distance—that we must ascribe the irresolution manifested by both England and France to take any hostile or decided step which might preclude an accommodation, and the obvious determination of all Powers except the combatants themselves, to hush up the quarrel by any means and at any price. It is this which made our government at once interfere to allay irritation and mediate a compromise; it is this which led our representatives to propose terms to Turkey which it would have been weakness in her to accept, and which it was disreputable in them to suggest; it is this which has made Austria alike ready to join Russia in coercing and terrifying the Porte, or to join the Western Powers in warning and thwarting the Czar; it is this which has made England and France slow and forbearing to the verge of silliness and weakness; and it is the knowledge of this feeling, its prevalence and power, which has emboldened Nicholas to press on to his designs with such arrogant and haughty violence.

We cannot therefore wonder that men, on whose head the responsibility of action must rest, should exhaust every contrivance of diplomacy and every effort of patience, before venturing to begin a war of which the nature will be so serious and the issues so distant and uncertain. Nor perhaps ought we to blame them too severely if, with such a prospect before them, they push forbearance beyond the limits of either dignity or prudence. We would only entreat them to remember that though it may be worth any effort and any sacrifice to *avoid* such a war as lies before them, merely to *postpone* it may be worth no effort and no sacrifice at all. If it must come, it is best it should come at a time when, as now, our case is clear, our cause is just, our allies are strong, and our means ample and ready. A year or two hence might find us in a far less favourable position for encountering whatever eventualities the future may have in store for us. Turkey might be exhausted by a long and fruitless attitude of armed inaction; possible controversies might have arisen with America; a coolness might have intervened between us and France; Russian intrigue might have sown dissension and distrust among her allied antagonists; and we might have a Caffre, an Affghan, or a Burmese war upon our hands. But be this as it may, one thing is quite clear to us, and we shall think our rulers very weak and very culpable if they neglect it:—the “Eastern Question” must be settled now *on terms which will afford at least a reasonable guarantec against its recurrence*. It will not do to have it constantly hanging over us ready to burst at any moment when our coffers are empty and our hands are full. Russia, we may be quite certain, will never abandon her designs or cease from her intrigues for the overthrow of Turkey and the possession of Constantinople, till arrangements have been made which shew her the utter and permanent hopelessness of such designs. Nor will it do for us to be liable to be constantly called in to prevent and repel her aggressions, whether diplomatic and stealthy, or armed and violent. Nor will it do for the successful discomfiture of her aggressions to depend upon the chance of friendly relations and a good understanding between France and England. Turkey—or its substitute and successor,—whatever power may hold Constantinople, Roumelia, and Asia Minor, the Ottoman dominions, in short,—*must be made self-supporting*, and must be made so now and for good. If the result of the present contest shall show that the Porte can hold her own, that Turkey is stronger and Russia weaker than has hitherto been supposed; and that her reforms and developed resources will render her in future single-handed a match for her colossal foe; or if, through the active aid of her allies, peace should be concluded on the fair and favourable terms already enumerated

—then our work will have been done, and we may dismiss all further anxiety from our minds. But the first is more than we can hope for: with all our knowledge of the elements of weakness and discord in the Muscovite empire, and with all our favourable opinion as to the improvement and unextinguished energies of the Ottoman Power, we cannot flatter ourselves that the latter, as at present constituted, will not always be greatly overmatched. How then are the two great rivals to be equalized, or so far equalized that the greater can never hope either to conquer or absorb the other? Two plans have been proposed: the first needs only to be stated in order to be condemned; the second needs only a few facts and a few moments' reflection in order to be dismissed as hopeless and absurd. The partition of Turkey among the European powers would be a crime, which, even if we were ripe for it, would bring its own punishment along with it in a progeny of interminable disputes and wars. The dismissal of the Mussulman race into the heart of Asia, and the establishment of a "Greek Empire," with Byzantium for its capital as of old, is the dream of a few ignorant enthusiasts. In the first place, the Mussulmans would not be so easily or speedily "dismissed." In Europe there are (to take Dr. Michelsen's and Mr. Urquhart's statistics) 3,800,000 Mahometans, of whom 1,100,000 are pure Osmanlis—brave, warlike, and fanatical, who might be conquered, but would never yield, in a war for empire and existence, and who would be supported to the last by their brethren in Asia, who are at least eleven or twelve millions more. But suppose all these beaten or exterminated—what are the elements for the composition of a "Greek Empire" in the place of European Turkey? We have a number of races, incongruous, hostile, and unamalgamated; various in origin, in blood, in character, and in religion—utterly *unfusable*, and of whom the "Greeks" do not form above one million out of fifteen. The rest are made up of such heterogeneous elements as the following:—*Wallachians and Moldavians*, of mixed Dacian, Roman, and Slavonic race, and in religion of the Greek Church,—wild shepherds, carriers, and tillers of the soil; *Bulgarians*, a mixture of Slavonic and Tartar blood, peaceable agriculturists, of whom about one-fourth are Mahometans, and the remainder Oriental Christians; *Servians*, entirely Slavonic, and entirely Oriental Christians; *Bosnians*, savage and warlike, of Slavonic origin, half Mahometan, a quarter belonging to the Latin, and a quarter to the Greek Church; *Albanians*, semi-barbarians, of mingled Slave, Illyrian, and Greek blood, mainly Mahometan, some Roman Catholics, and some Oriental Christians; besides *Armenians* and *Jews* in considerable numbers. Here are at least five races and three

religions:—pure Slavonians, mixed Slavonians; pure Greeks, mixed Greeks; Slavonians who are Catholics, Slavonians who are Greek Christians, Slavonians who are fanatical Mahometans. How can a homogeneous and centralized empire be formed out of such repellent elements? and how can a “Greek empire” be constituted out of a wilderness of races and creeds, of whom only about one-fifteenth have any title to be called Greeks at all—and this fifteenth, though the shrewdest, by no means the most energetic, and assuredly the least commanding? “All these populations,” says Urquhart, “have accepted the Turks as masters; not one of them would endure for a moment the supremacy of any of the others. If you had not the Turks you would require to invent them, unless you wish to see European Turkey a chaos of bloodshed.”

It must not, however, be imagined that these several races have always acquiesced willingly and patiently in the domination of their Ottoman rulers, or that they do not each indulge their own ambitious dreams of future development and supremacy. Most of them have in turn been restive, and several have obtained a greater or less degree of virtual independence. One way remains to combine all objects, realize all hopes, and meet, as far as possibility permits, all desires. Change Turkey-in-Europe from a substantive empire into a Federal Union of States; make the Sultan the *suzerain* instead of the autocrat of the various provinces of his dominion; assimilate all the other divisions to what Serbia is now, and what Wallachia would be but for Russian interference; let each State govern itself, but pay a tribute to the central powers, and, if need be, in case of war furnish a specified contingent. The Porte would then remain (what it is well qualified to be) a military and diplomatic supreme head, with Roumelia only as its special appanage; and would cease to be (what probably it cannot successfully become) an administrative power. And the change would be very small, and perhaps after a time scarcely perceptible; for three of the European provinces are already virtually independent—Bosnia and Albania are always struggling to become so; and of all the governments of Europe there is none so little bureaucratic—none of which the action is so slightly felt, and penetrates so feebly into the daily life of the people,—as that of Turkey, unless we except our own. Under such an arrangement as this, the heart-burnings which at present exist between the dominant and the subject races in the Ottoman dominions would soon die away; each separate State would be at liberty to follow its own inherent tendencies, to develop its own special resources, and to carry out its own special form of civilisation; and the central and supreme Executive would be felt only as a

protection against foreign aggression, and a control upon intestine discord.

But would Turkey,—thus re-organized upon a natural, healthy, and permanent footing, be able to stand her ground and form an adequate and enduring barrier against Muscovite encroachments and intrigues? *Probably* she would; for then no one of the constituent States would be willing for an instant to listen to any proposals of exchanging its own free and hopeful future for the dreary and dismal fate of incorporation with the over-grown dominion and subjection to the crushing and paralyzing sceptre of Russia. *Possibly* she might not—were this change the only one. But assuredly she would, with an aid which we should propose to give her, and which would make the future as secure and tranquil as futures can ever be. *With Hungary independent and allied*, (and the alliance is natural, for sentiments of friendship and consanguinity have long existed, and interests are identical,) the Magyars, the Slaves, and the Ottomans would be safe, and Russian ambition would be for ever baffled and beaten back. Even with Hungary re-united to Austria under her old constitution, with the guarantee of her own ministry, her own army, and her admitted nationality; with old wounds healed, old wrongs forgiven, and old imperial intrigues surrendered because hopeless—(and this, if Austria were but wise, *might be achieved to-morrow*,) the future would be nearly if not quite as secure; for, under such a healing arrangement Austria would be again powerful enough to feel independent of Russian aid, and therefore no longer a reluctant and fettered accomplice in Russian crime. A little timely wisdom at Vienna, and a little safe and needed spirit in London and at Paris, might arrange this glorious pacification of Europe ere another month had passed. If something of this sort is not done, and done soon, the perils which we shall have to encounter at no distant date, we believe in our hearts to be at least as certain as that we shall have only our own blindness, our own languor, our own timidity to thank for them.

INDEX

TO THE

TWENTIETH VOLUME OF THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

- American Novels, 81—Hawthorne, 83—Mrs. Stowe, 99.—Elizabeth Wetherell, 101—Longfellow, 106.
- Arago, François, 439—his education and election to science, 460—sets out to measure the arch of a terrestrial meridian, 462—his adventures and sufferings, 463—elected member of the Institute, 465—lectures on Astronomy, 467—*Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, 469—Artesian wells at Grenelle, 471—his oratorical powers, 471—appointed Director of the Observatory, 472—visit to Edinburgh, 473—his republican predilections, 474—conduct in the Provisional Government, 475—refuses the oath of allegiance, his letter, 477—funeral obsequies, eulogé of M. Ilourens, 482—his optical discoveries, 486—the undulatory and the emission theories, 488—his discoveries in magnetism, 491—who invented the electric telegraph? 492—his numerous unpublished theories, 495—summary of his character, 496—attack upon his character by the *Quarterly Review*, 498.
- Astronomical Society, institution of, 245.
- Augsburg Confession, renewal of at Berlin in 1853, 432.
- Austria, position of, in the war in the East, 529.
- Bacon, Lord, his project for a Philosophical Society, 214.
- Bähr's edition of Herodotus, 389.
- Barral, J. A., his eulogé on F. Arago, 459.
- Biblical Exegesis, neglect of, at the English Universities, 320—divinity examinations, 321—importance of exegetical studies, 323—German works on biblical literature, 325—disadvantages inseparable from translations, 327—recent contributions to the science by Hare, Trench, Stanley, Alford, Conybeare, and Howson, 328—prospects of biblical literature, 337.
- Bodenstedt, Frederick, notice of his "Moring Land," 270.
- Bonaparte, his bitter persecution of Madame de Staël, 17.
- Botanical Geography, 501—constituent branches of natural history, 502—artificial and natural systems of plants, 505—geographical and physical distribution of plants, 507—distribution of British plants, 509—division into types, 513—geographical centres from which plants have been diffused, 514—supposed origin of British plants, 517—objections to the doctrine of primary centres of distribution, 518—the erration of many individuals of a species, 521.
- Boyle, Hon. Robert, his merits as an experimental philosopher, 225, 232.
- British Association for the Advancement of Science, 246.
- Burlamarei, singular family of, 72.
- Byzantium, Russian invasions of, 251.
- Candlemaking and Christianity, 161—commercial history of Price's Patent Candle Company, 161—moral history, Belmont schools, 164—James Wilson and Thomas Arnold, 165—educational report of the Company, 167—benevolence repaid in hard cash, 169—success leads to increased beneficence, 171—the change in the labour market, 175—Belmont tracts, 177.
- Celtic national music, 350.
- Charles II., his connexion with the Royal Society, 225, 228, 233.
- Church government in Germany, 434—consistorial, 431—synodal, 437.
- Classical learning, a preparation suitable for a great destiny, 461.
- Collier, J. Payne, his notes and emendations of Shakespeare, 287, 304.
- Consistorial system of church government, 434.
- Constant, Benjamin, the friend and ally of Madame de Staël for twenty years, 33—his character, 35.
- Conybeare and Howson's Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 328—general design of the work, 329—style and manner of Mr. Howson's portion, 330—Mr. Conybeare's contributions, 333—specimens of his new translations, 334—general merits of the work, 339.
- Dahlmann's biography of Herodotus, 389.
- Diodati, family of, 72, *note*.
- Domestic service—Nelly Armstrong, 179—too little attention paid to the subject of domestic service, 179—advantages and disadvantages of service near home, 181—dreary kitchen life, 185—instinctive longings for companionship, 186—want of confidence between different classes of society, 189—familiarity with servants, 191—duties of employers, 192—dangerous attractiveness of maid servants, 195—"no followers allowed," 199—effects of rigorous severity, 200—importance of

- training schools for servants, 203—comforts of domestic service, 204—want of family sympathy, 207—unhappy effects of class-prejudice, 208.
- Electric Telegraph first suggested by C. M. of Renfrew, 492.
- Eynard, Charles, notice of his "Lucques et les Burlamaechi," 70.
- Farini, Signor, opinions of, on the secular rule of the Popes, 49.
- Flamsteed, John, account of his appointment as "Astronomical Observer," and the institution of the Greenwich Observatory, 230.
- Flourens, M., his eulogy on F. Arago, 459.
- Forbes, Prof. Ed., on the dispersion of plants, 515.
- Geological Society, institution of, 244.
- German Protestantism, struggles and tendencies of, 423—religious statistics of Berlin and other great cities, 121—revival of doctrine in the universities, 127—decline of rationalism in the pulpit, 428—defects of German preaching, 431—Berlin Kirchentag, renewal of the Augsburg Confession, 432—church government and organization, 433—the consistorial system, 434—the synodal system, 437—progress of lay influence and church independence, 438—mutual relations of the churches, union and confederation, 441—union of the Lutheran and Reformed, 442—opposition to it and persecution, 443—the Kirchentag and Confederation, 447—relation of the state paid churches with the dissenters, 449—decline of intolerance and state-papedom, 450—relation of the German churches to the state, 452—liturgical controversy, 453—labours of the Inner Mission, 454—destiny of Protestant Germany, 457.
- German works on Biblical Literature, 325.
- Gibbon's early and continued attachment to Madame Necker, 9.
- Gioberti, Vincent, account of his life and writings, 38.
- Greek, language and literature of Modern, 135—remarkable lack of information on the subject, 136—examination of a passage of modern Greek, 138—true character of Romaic, 139—old Romaic Ballad, 141—reasons for the preservation of the Greek language, 142—influence of the Turkish conquest, 145—literature of modern Greece, 146—schools and university, 147—popular Romaic ballads, 150—living Greek poets, Karatsoutsas, 153—Alexander Ypsilante, 159—facility of learning Greek from living Greeks, 159.
- Halley, Edmund, Clerk to the Royal Society, prints Newton's *Principia* at his own expense, 235.
- Hamilton, Sir William, his opinion on the Universities, 371, 375.
- Harvey, Dr., anecdote of, 219.
- Herodotus, *Life and Writings of*, 389—the three disputed questions, 392—did he write for recitation? 393—his mode of composition, as deduced from his own expressions, from evidence and the opinion of critics, 394—question as to the place at which he wrote, 399—how far Thucydides was acquainted with his works, 400—Lucian's tale of the tears of admiration shed by Thucydides, 390, 402—comparison of Herodotus with Sophocles, 402—chronology of his life and writings, 405—evidence for the date of his composition from the allusion to the revolt of the Medes, and to Amyrteus, 408—summary of his chronology, 413—his character as a historian, 415—the sources of his narratives, 419—the matter and the form of his writings, 420—his credulity and superstition, 420—character of his religion, 421.
- Heyse's Dissertation on the Life and Writings of Herodotus, 389.
- Hooke, Dr. Robert, his contributions to physical science, 225, 239—his character, 240.
- Hooker, Dr., on the dispersion of plants, 515.
- Hungarian music, 319.
- Inner Mission in Germany, 454.
- Karamzin's History of Russia, notice of, 255, 257.
- Karatsoutsas, notice of his poetry, 153.
- Kenrick's Egypt of Herodotus, 389.
- Kioff, the rival of Constantinople in the eleventh century, 254.
- Kirchentag, Berlin, its renewal of the Augsburg Confession, 432—its efforts for reform, 447.
- Knight's edition of Shakespeare, 287, 295, 298.
- Linnæan Society, establishment of, 214.
- Liturgical services in Germany, 453.
- Logography, value of, 415.
- London University, origin and object of, 365.
- Longfellow, H. W., review of his "Hyperion" and "Kavanagh," 106.
- Mace, Royal Society's illusions regarding it dispelled, 226.
- Mamiani, Count, opinions of, regarding the Papacy, 49.
- Mariotti, Signor, on Italian Protestantism, 66.
- Mendicant Friars, account of, 113—Wycliffe's denunciation of them, 131.

- Mongol or Tahtar conquest of Russia 235—its consequences, 256
- Monograph, merits of, as a form of biography, 110.
- Montague, Charles, Earl of Halifax, his connexion with Sir Isaac Newton, 237.
- Müller, K. O., on the History of Herodotus, 389.
- Mure, Colonel, notice of his Language and Literature of Ancient Greece, 319.
- Music, National, 311—definition of music, 342—its origin and earliest development, 343—character of ancient music, 344—connexion between rhythmus and language, 344, 347—music of the East, 345—of the Slaves, the Poles, and the Hungarians, 346—of the Celts, 350—of the Scotch, Irish, and Welsh, 352—of the Teutonic family, 354—of the French and Italians, 355—of the English, 358.
- Natural History, constituent branches of, 502
- Necker, James, career of, 3—reputation as a financier, 4—his retirement and old age, 7.
- Necker, Madame, her attachment for Gibbon, 9.
- "Nelly Armstrong," notice of, 179.
- Newton, Sir Isaac, elected a fellow of the Royal Society, 229—his *Principia* presented, 235.
- Norris, Maria, review of her "Life and Times of Madame de Staël," 1.
- Nuyts, Professor, his controversy with the Pope, 53.
- Oliphant, L., notice of his "Russian Shores of the Black Sea," 523.
- Piedmont, progress of, 45—secret of its prosperity, 51.
- Pope, temporal power of the, denounced by Gioberti, Tommasco, and other reformers, 45
- Protestantism in Italy, 37—influence of Vincent Gioberti, 39—character and scope of his works, 40—progress of Piedmont, 43—Gioberti's programme of reform, 45—Niccolo Tommasco, 46—denounces the temporal dominion of the Pope, 47—count Mamiani and Signor Farini, 49—the secret of Sardinian prosperity, 51—Controversy between Rome and Turin, 52—Propositions of Professor Nuyts, 53—Italian writers and Protestantism, 56—religious ignorance in Italy, 59—causes of the hold Roman Catholicism maintains in Italy, 59—a political reformation insufficient, 63—Signor Mariotti, 64—an Italian champion of Protestantism, 65—apostolate of Fra Dolcino, 67—Girolamo Savonarola, 68—Burlamacchi of Lucca, 70—reformed Church at Ferrara. Olympia Morata, 73—modern evangelical movement, 77—dangers of Italian Protestantism, 78.
- Rationalism, decline of, in Germany, 127.
- Rhythmus, *see* Music.
- Roman Catholic religion, causes of its firm hold of Italy, 590.
- Royal Society of London, history of, by C. R. Weld, 209—organization and endowment of our social institutions, 209—value of Mr. Weld's work, 211—revival of literature and science in Italy, 212—state of science in the 16th century, 213—Bacon's project for a philosophical society, 214—societies of Oxford and London, 217—anecdote of Harvey and Charles I, 219—influence of the Royal Society in uprooting superstition, 221—incorporated by Royal Charter, 225—Philosophical Transactions, Oldenburg arrested, 277—Newton elected a fellow, 229—John Flamsteed, 230. Greenwich Observatory, 231—death of Robert Boyle, 233—Newton's *Principia* communicated, 234—Halley appointed clerk, 235—Newton and Charles Montague, 237—death of Robert Hooke, 239—Newton President, 240—death of Newton, 242—the Royal Society split into various societies, 245—opportunity of uniting all the societies, 247.
- Rurik, the Russian Empire founded by, 251.
- Russia, the religious and political relations of, 248—historical law of Russian aggression, 249—Russian invasion of Byzantium, 251—introduction of Christianity, 252—conquest of the Mongols, 253—consequences to the Church, 255—effects on the character of the people, 257—development of the power of Moscow, 259—first regular war between Russia and Turkey, 261—war between Russia and Turkey in the reign of Catherine, 264—Russia and Turkey in the wars of Napoleon, 266—the Church of Russia as a political tool, 269—Bodenstedt's picture of it, 270—the head of the Russian and the head of the Roman Church compared, 273—antagonisms and sympathies between the Roman, Greek, and Protestant Churches, 274—military resources of Russia, 277—probable policy of Nicholas, 279.
- Russian aggression in the East, 524—her resources, 535—Russo-Greek Church, 547.
- Salomon, Prof. E. A., on the historic questions concerning Herodotus, 389.
- Savonarola, account of, and his opinions, 68.
- Shakespeare, text of, 281—connexion between words and ideas, 282—readers who can dispense with verbal correctness, 283—Shakespeare's sensitiveness in regard

- to expression, 284—First Folio, 286—the antiquarian in contradistinction to the philological mode of forming a text, 287—First Folio idolatry, 289—examples of ingenious emendations of difficult passages, 290—Heming and Condell, 293—eccentricities of the First Folio, 295—what errors due to the printers and what to the editors, 296—first act of *Macbeth* examined, departures from the old readings, 298—providential specimens, 301—suspicious readings, 303—justice to Shakespeare induces caution in admitting the entire correctness of the First Folio, 307—Mr Collier's discovery and its value, 308—his method of exposition, 313—Mr Dyce's "few notes," 315—hypothesis of the new readings, 316.
- Slavonic race, national music of, 348.
- Stael, life and times of Madame de, 1—character of her parents, 3, 8—early development of her talents, 10—Parisian society in 1780, 11—her marriage, 12—her fortunes and occupations during the reign of Terror, 13—French friendships, 14—her estimate of Bonaparte, 15—employment in exile, 17—Schiller's and Goethe's view of her, 18—Lord Byron's account of her, 20—general character of her writings, 21—her melancholy, 22.
- Stearie candle manufacture, 161.
- Steevens' edition of Shakespeare, 288.
- Stowe, Mrs, criticism of her style, 99.
- Superstitions of the sixteenth century, 221.
- Talleyrand, misconceptions of his character, 21—his early life, 25—educated for the church, 25—a revolutionist 26—proscribed in France, banished from England, goes to America, 27—his connexion with and opinion of Bonaparte, 29—important services to the restored Bourbons and Louis Philippe, 31—summary of his character, 32.
- Toutonic music, 354.
- Thucydides, tale of his shedding tears at the recital of the history of Herodotus, 390.
- Thugut, Baron, predicts the future aggressions of Russia against Turkey, 262.
- Turkey, *see* War in the East.
- Turkey, its first regular war with Russia, 261—with the Empress Catherine, assisted by Austria, 264—designs of Russia against, 262, 268.
- University representation, 361—principles upon which the suffrage should be bestowed, 362—constituency of Oxford and Cambridge, 364—and Dublin, 365—claims of the University of London to representation, 360—claim of London medical graduates, 369—of Scotch medical students, 371—of Scotch master of arts, 372—suggestions for forming a learned class in Scotland, 374—conferring the suffrage on the universities, 374—better system of examination and patronage, 375—alteration in their government, 377—national Board of Examiners, 378—graduation for the Church and the Bar, 378—literary examination for medical students, 381—moral and social training, 383—increased endowments, 387.
- Vaughan, Robert, D.D., review of his *Life of Wycliffe*, 110.
- Waldenses, 51, 67.
- War in the East and its political contingencies, 523—history of Russian aggressions, 524—Russian craft in choosing her time, 526—position and culpability of Austria, 529—England's dereliction of duty, 530—blame of the English press, 532—Mr Cobden's share in the common sin, 533—prospects of the war, 534—resources of Russia, 535—commissariat department, 538—army arrangements, 540—internal enemies, 541—resources of Turkey, 542—her new career of improvement, 543—Russian or Ottoman success desirable? 546—false plea of co-religion, 547—Mussulman and Muscovite tariffs, 553—Russian treatment of the Danubian trade, 554—the various contingencies to be considered, 556—co-operation of the four powers, 557—American intervention, 559—eventual questions between France and England, 561—necessity for a final settlement now of the question, 566—schemes proposed, 566.
- Watson, H. W., review of Mrs Cybele Buntannea, 501.
- Weld, Charles Richard, review of his *History of the Royal Society*, 209.
- Wetherell, Elizabeth, remarks on her writings, 101—want of purity in her diction, 101—romance and religion, 105.
- Wycliffe, John de, D.D., *Life of*, by Dr. Vaughan, 110—difference between the regular biography and a monograph, 110—merits of the work, 111—early life of Wycliffe, 112—opposition to the Mendicant Friars, 113—opinions on the relation of the Church to the State, 115—anti-Papal party in England, 116—his teaching at Oxford, 118—his mission to the Pope, 120—called to account, 121—defended by the Duke of Lancaster, 122—his eighteen "conclusions," 124—his life in the rectory of Lutterworth, 125—Lollardism, 127—the different religious reformers compared, 128—character of Wycliffe's genius, 131—character of his speculations, 153.
- Ypsilante, Alexander, notice of his poetry, 159.

